Gc
974.5
F91t
1667519

M. L.

REYNOLDS HISTORICAL
GENEALOGY COLLECTION

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1833 01146 6791

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/twohundredfiftie00soci

MOSES BROWN SCHOOL, PROVIDENCE, R. I.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH

ANNIVERSARY

OF THE BEGINNING OF

NEW ENGLAND

YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS

HELD AT

MOSES BROWN SCHOOL

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

SIXTH MONTH, 24TH, 1911

1667519

PROGRAM

MORNING SESSION

AUGUSTINE JONES, Presiding

9:30 o'clock, Meeting for Worship

10:00 Opening Remarks
AUGUSTINE JONES

10:20 "The Early History of New England Yearly Meeting"
RUFUS M. JONES

11:00 "The Mission of a Message"
MARY MENDENHALL HOBBS
Of North Carolina Yearly Meeting

11:30 Address,
GOVERNOR POTHIER of Rhode Island

12:00 Poem, "Our First Yearly Meeting"
WALTER S. MEADER

AFTERNOON SESSION

SETH K. GIFFORD, Presiding

2:00 o'clock, Remarks

2:15 Address, "The Religious Discoveries of George Fox"
PROF. EDWARD C. MOORE of Cambridge, Mass.

3:00 "The Quaker Conquest"
JAMES WOOD of New York Yearly Meeting

3:30 Address
ISAAC SHARPLESS of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting

4:00 Responses
Visiting Delegates from other Yearly Meetings

7:30 Address, "The Young Friend, Then and Now"
L. HOLLINGSWORTH WOOD

OPENING REMARKS

Augustine Jones

We are gathered to commemorate the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the origin of the Yearly Meeting of Friends for New England, and to mark its historic significance.

It is notable as the only yearly meeting on the continent, with the exception of Baltimore, which George Fox attended, and the oldest in the world.*

George Rofe, an English Friend, with two companions, whose names have not reached us, appointed a General Friends Meeting, at Newport, R. I., on the Sabbath, Sixth Month 9th, 1661, for all New England.

That illustrious planting has, with few if any omissions, been followed annually to this day, by yearly meetings.

This remarkable convocation dissolved, after four days of gospel fervor, and stirring Foxian utterances.

* Since these remarks were made a note from England has been shown to me mentioning a general meeting in London in 1661, the date of our origin, which is meant to suggest I suppose, the beginning of their meeting to be of even date with ours.

The Society of Friends we know had risen long before this period. There had been general meetings in England as early as 1654 and thereafter, at sundry times and in divers places, not always annual, often years apart.

But in 1672, it is noted in the "Minute Book," that there is to be a General Meeting of Friends held in London, once a year, in the week called Whitsun week." Charles Lamb says the custom prevailed in his time. The ancient Discipline remarks, "It is agreed that a general meeting be held in London annually (1672) and declares in its history of London Yearly Meeting this to be the date of its establishment; and in the title page of the volume it asserts, "Their yearly meeting held in London from its first institution." This implies that there was no former institution thereof. Yearly meetings for women, as we once knew them here, we think were not set up there until 1784, with some misgivings. It would seem that finally in 1672, the yearly meeting, by a special resolve or minute, established the annual meetings to be at London, hence is name, constitution and historic existence ever after. There have been recent removals. There is in our minds neither controversy nor rivalry. The matter is now not important, except in the verification of history.

It was in America, an historic, luminous birthday of a great and righteous energy.

If we except Rhode Island, and Shelter Island in N. Y., there was not one nook, in North America, at that moment, where a Friend could land without exposing himself to bitter suffering, and his shipmaster to severe penalty.

George Bishop says that the numbers who attended the meeting were so considerable that Boston was alarmed, because "the Quakers were gathering together in Newport to kill their people and fire the town."

Boston had then a disquieted conscience.

It had executed two Friends in 1659; Mary Dyer in 1660, breathing the holy words, "Obedient to the will of God I came, and obedient to His will, I remain faithful unto death." While ninety days previous to this assemblage, William Leddra, the fourth martyr, went to the scaffold.

It is a striking coincidence, that jail delivery was granted in Boston to twenty-eight Friends, Fourth Day, Sixth Month 12th, the very day this meeting closed; and one of them, Wenlock Christison, with courage like Luther, with dedication like St. Paul, "ready to be offered," was then under sentence to be hung the next day; while two others were waiting their hours of execution. Do we ourselves need now the trumpets of fiery persecution to summon us to the issues of eternal life?

It was not the "Quaking" at Newport, which severed prison bars in Boston. It was the political fall of the Puritans in England, the restoration of the Stuarts, of Charles II; the rise to power of the English Church, and the consequent peril to Puritanism in America, which excited momentary consternation.

Neither was it the King's Missive (though that did subsequently liberate prisoners). The Missive did not issue until autumn, and did not arrive in Boston until late in October. The magistrates, dissembled, bowed obedience to the British throne, and went on with different, nevertheless cruel persecution. Like the son in Scripture, who said, "I go, sir; and went not."

Boston is one of the most tolerant and progressive cities in the world, and is not responsible for the conduct of other generations.

We only seek history and the progress of events! It is, indeed, to us a stupendous concern that this organization began to exist in the midst of malignant persecution; and that possibly its first audience consisted mostly of maimed, marred, non-resistant disciples of George Fox. The suffering was bitter then, like Christian, apostolic struggles of a darker age. English Friends sat between the continuous fires of two persecutions, which were devoid of executions.

Both the Puritan and the Friend were destined to immense service in the United States. They started from utterly different standpoints, and thoughtfully advanced with great misgivings, each toward the other.

Doctor Mulford says, "They were the historical forces with which no others may be compared in their influence on the American people." This exalted pretension is not our own. "Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth." "Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them."

George Rofe, our founder, had an earlier record. He was in the Palatinate of the Rhine, in 1657, engaged with one William Ames in welding in the power of the spirit, a village group of Germans to the tenets of the Society of Friends. This colony, subsequently, under the direction of William Penn, planted Germantown, Pa., now a portion of Philadelphia. Pastorious of this company, to his eternal honor, drew in writing the first protest of a religious body against American slavery. We cherish the memory of George Rofe, a living apostle of Jesus Christ, whose works do follow him in abiding testimony to the grace of God which attended him.

What have the members of this yearly meeting done in the two hundred and fifty growing years, which renders it worth while to study its annals?

Its unobtrusive energy, and altruistic spirit has wrought constantly among our fellow-creatures with glowing devotion, mostly in the busy haunts of rural life. Its consecrated fellowship has sustained houses of worship, not costly, usually of common wood, without adornment, with free sittings for all men and women of every race and previous condition of servitude. Simple Christian democracy, it has been devoid of creed, ordinances, rituals, music or compensated ministry until

recently. If you would study the converting power into holier life, which often abode in these meetings, even when silent, read Charles Lamb's "Essay on a Quaker's Meeting," or note the sterling quality and character of the men and women nurtured in them. Fruitage tests the essential value.

Friends have been concentrated in thought, generally right, if sometimes narrow; a thin blade goes most deeply to the roots of gigantic evil. Churches with exalted conceptions of conduct (which is three fourths of life) are not usually popular. The strait and narrow way is not attractive to certain persons. The dean of a noted theological school said the other day, "Wherever the church has held up high ideals, wherever it has held up a high standard of living, it has caused most men to turn away indifferent. It is bound to be so. . . . That church nevertheless is making the world better."

Our sensuous, spendthrift, luxurious existence spurns the sublime doctrine of living within the bounds of one's circumstances. We need strenuous conversion to the simple life of the Quaker of the olden time, to put the emphasis on righteousness, like our illustrious predecessors. A better age will come, the progress of truth is usually spiral, gyrating, disappearing, and again reappearing with new appeals to other minds with greater light.

Friends have certainly produced honesty, sincerity, and purity of life. Their influence has entered the very veins of the modern world. There are about four thousand of them, men, women and children, abroad in New England. They have shown their apostolic sympathy by the support of brethren not in affluence, by eminent philanthropy in every crisis.

They have fought a good fight and kept the faith against dogmatic theology, all forms of human slavery, war, intemperance, uncanny oaths, and all unrighteousness, and have, by grace, won on many fields. Their paramount protests and their marvelous triumphs are inscribed in the ancient constitutions and laws of New England.

Neal Dow, the most notable agitator against the liquor traffic in the last century, was cradled at the fireside of a New England Quaker. The meeting has a giant peacemaker, Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood, and another illustrious philan-

thropist, Albert K. Smiley, whose potent voice encircles the globe from his mountain heights, with songs echoing far off, "Peace on earth, good will to men"; while he extends brotherly love and the sympathy of Christ to our afflicted wards, the North American Indians.

This yearly meeting is doing excellent work in foreign missions. Its members with others have planted its faith across the continent, even to the Pacific shore, whither gold allures or where rolls the Oregon. Its census would now be much greater but for the absence of long lost heralds of the faith who went Westward Ho to less favored people, on the ever extending line of new settlements.

We have produced brilliant scholars. Pres. Edward Everett of Harvard declared Thomas Chase to be not only first in his class, but first of his period in the University; while Professsor Thayer said of him, "He was the most finished Greek scholar among the American translators of the New Version of Scripture. His brother, Pliny, was his rival in learning. There have been many distinguished professors, teachers, students; some of whom wear no Quaker insignia now, but nevertheless owe to the society most of what they are.

It produced Goold Brown, the most extensive writer on English grammar of the last century. It is to be credited with one eminent artist, William Bradford, whose paintings are cherished everywhere. It has sent forth many teachers of righteousness to foreign lands.

Prominent men have appeared in politics: one signer of the Declaration of Independence, Stephen Hopkins; members of Congress, without fear and without reproach; governors of Commonwealths; mayors of cities; members of legislatures, all with good repute. If you ask for ability which went not in the ways of the fathers, I present to you Gen. Nathaniel Greene, the second general of the Revolution, who in youth, with his Quaker-preaching blacksmith father, at their Rhode Island forge, beat the smithy anvil; and later he beat the British lion, and was disowned.

Our own brilliant Whittier has unveiled the splendor of New England scenery, and the beauty of other lands. He has given utterance to the polity of Friends more potent than any

other man of our time. He was a strong purifying force in the politics of his Commonwealth. He sang the unrighteous life out of African slavery. Garrison, who was an authority, said at the last meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society in Faneuil Hall, Boston, "To John Greenleaf Whittier, more than to any other man living or dead, the abolition of American slavery is due." George Fox and his divine message are marching through the hymn books of christendom in the inspired songs of Whittier.

There have been princely merchants among these Friends. They once, by the whale fishery, led the world in artificial light, through William Rotch and others from Nantucket, New Bedford and Europe.

Moses Brown, was a leader in the manufacture of pure cotton fabric by power in America. Consider for one moment its present magnitude in this country.

There have been many other eminent manufacturers, and now are presidents of banks, trustees, business men of excellent quality.

But this school, and another in Maine, have in any event established the utility of this venerable yearly meeting and vindicated its right to exist.

The light of truth has shone from this eminence almost a century, and if we start from the primal origin of the school, its history reaches two years beyond the middle of the 250 years we celebrate; and the prayers and devoted efforts of this meeting have attended it at every step. Its healthful influence has traversed the nation and passed its extreme boundary. Thousands have gone hence, with the gifts and graces of learning, luminous with non-clanish Christianity, and exalted moral ideals.

The school grows annually, with new accretions, like the great trees towering on its campus, which have seen all of its history, as our cherishing mother has watched over every child.

The trees are chiefly for adornment, but "the leaves" of the august Tree, itself, which they embellish, "are for the healing of the nations," bearing on every wind of Heaven, the glad tidings of the everlasting gospel of truth!

The yearly meeting had illustrious founders, who stood on

the very brink of martyrdom, and in prayer and sacrifice reared its superstructure and their successors with the blessing of Heaven, and consistent lives have nobly sustained it.

"Let us praise famous men," saith the wise son of Sirach; "The Lord hath wrought great glory by them, through His great power from the beginning.'

FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE, NEWPORT, R. I.

THE EARLY HISTORY OF NEW ENGLAND YEARLY MEETING

By Rufus M. Jones

There is an ancient chronicle which relates how contact with the bones of Israel's great prophet Elisha requickened a body that was lowered down into his quiet resting-place and set the tides of life circulating again. No one ever knows what amazing things may happen by a renewal of contact with prophets, "who through faith have subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, and obtained promises." If we could today not only stir the historic dust of our founders but get once more back into vital relation with their palpitating spirits and for a few minutes see the *vision* for which they lived and died, this ancient miracle at the prophet's tomb might be repeated even in our busy and commercial age.

The most impressive fact which stands out in the story of "The Quaker Invasion" of New England is *the irresistible and conquering power of the faith* of the men and women who dedicated themselves to the task of planting on these shores what seemed to them to be the *truth*. They felt themselves pushed forth to their "hardships and hazards" by an unseen hand and "freely they gave up for the seed's sake," as an old epistle puts it, "their friends, their relations, their country and worldly estates, yea, and their own lives also," and, having made their great surrender and dedication, they were henceforth afraid of nothing, but failure to follow their heavenly vision.

The actual pioneers of New England Quakerism, the real founders of this yearly meeting, were eleven persons who in the summer of 1657 came across the ocean in their own little boat, the *Woodhouse*, which, as they believed, the Lord steered, "like as He did Noah's Ark, wherein He shut up a few righteous persons and landed them safe even at the hill Ararat." "We saw the Lord," they declare, "leading our vessel, even as it were a man leading a horse by the head!" Early in the month now called August, these Argonauts landed at Newport,

R.I., and disembarked with the *word* ringing in their ears: "The Seed of God in America shall be as the sand of the sea," and when the *word* was announced, "it caused tears to break forth with fullness of joy."

This band of eleven became the first publishers of the Quaker message on the island of Rhode Island, in Providence, Martha's Vineyard, Sandwich, Plymouth, Salem, Dover, and other New England centers. As their hard campaign was beginning, one of the company expressed what they all felt: "God's power has led us all along, and I have seen His glory and am overcome with His love. Take no thought for me, for my trust is in the Lord: only be valiant for the truth. The Lord's power hath overshadowed me, and man I do not fear." That is the spirit of the Quaker apostles who planted the seed in these regions. They were travailing in the power of an *experience* which made them able to say in all sincerity: "I have seen His glory and am overcome with His love!" In less than four years from the time they landed, the meeting was held in Newport which we celebrate today.

This meeting was called by an English Friend named George Rofe who visited all the centers of Quakerism in the western world in 1661. In a letter written from Barbadoes to Richard Hubberthorne, George Rofe gives the following account of this first general meeting ever held in America: "We came in at Rhode Island and appointed a general meeting for all Friends in those parts (meaning all New England), which was a very great meeting and very precious, and continued four days together and the Lord was with His people and blessed them and all departed in peace. There is a good seed in that people, but the enemy keeps some under, through their cruel persecution, yet their honesty preserves them, and *the seed will arise*, as way is made for the visitation of the power of God to have free liberty amongst them." Unfortunately there are no records in existence of this meeting and no descriptions of its type and character, but we may safely infer that it was in all respects like the general meetings which had already been held in England. They were held for two main purposes: (1) For spiritual comfort and edification, and (2) to consider such things as "concerned the affairs of truth." An epistle from

the general meeting held at Balby in 1656 shows that "affairs of truth" included the settlement of the times of holding meetings; the setting up of *new* meetings; dealing with such as walked disorderly; giving counsel to ministers who "speak from the mouth of the Lord"; making collections for the poor and the persecuted; making provision for the families of those who are called forth in the ministry; making regulations for marriages and the recording of births and deaths and issuing advices to the members upon their daily walk and conversation among men.

We may assume that this first general meeting in the new world followed the old world model and dealt with such matters as concerned the life and prosperity of the meetings scattered through the colonies of Rhode Island, Plymouth and Massachusetts. How the business was transacted, whether there were clerks to take the sense of the meeting, whether any documents were issued, and many other interesting questions, must remain unanswered, for we have no accounts to draw upon. One contemporary report of the meeting has come down to us from an important historian. George Bishop, in his *New England Judged*, says, under date of 1661, "About this time the general meeting at Rhode Island, about sixty miles from Boston, *was set up*," and he gives graphic evidence that the meeting was large and attracted much attention. "You" (people of Boston), he says, "made an alarm that the Quakers were gathering together to kill the people and to fire the town of Boston!"

Friends were by this date spread in isolated groups all the way from Providence and Newport to the Piscataqua River, and this meeting two hundred and fifty years ago brought the settlers together from these various regions for four days of precious meeting, "waiting upon the Lord," as Bishop says, "and seeing into the faces of one another." It was not in all respects like a present-day yearly meeting, but the essence of the matter was there, and we may well call George Rofe's meeting "for all Friends in these parts," the birth date of our beloved New England Yearly Meeting.

The next important question is whether the "meetings for all Friends in these parts," thus begun in 1661, were continued annually. Our chief witness that they were so held is John

Burnyeat who was one of the pillar apostles of Quakerism in the new world. He first visited Rhode Island in the early summer of 1666, five years after the first great general meeting and again in 1671. Of his second visit in the early summer of 1671, he writes: "I took shipping for Rhode Island, and was there at their yearly meeting in 1671, which begins the Ninth of the Fourth Month (June of our present calendar) *every year*, and continues much of a week, and is a general meeting once a year for all Friends in New England."

As he had been here five years before, and now says that the meeting is a "yearly meeting," "begins on the Ninth of Sixth Month," "is held every year" and "is for all Friends in New England," we may, I think, consider it a settled fact that the meeting begun in 1661 was continuous through that first decade. George Fox's testimony is the next available evidence which we have. His account shows clearly what was the type of the meeting established here. He attended it in 1672. He had arrived at Newport the thirtieth day of the Sixth Month (new style) and he says: "The week following the Yearly Meeting for all the Friends of New England and the other colonies adjacent was held on this island. This meeting lasted six days, the first four days being general public meetings for worship, to which abundance of other people (than Friends) came, for they have no priest in the island, and no restriction to any particular way of worship; and both the governor (Nicholas Easton) and the deputy governor (John Cranston, not a Friend), with several justices of the peace daily frequented the meetings; so encouraged the people that they flocked in from all parts of the island. I have rarely observed people hear with more attention, diligence and affection than generally they did during the four days together. After these public meetings were over, the men's meeting began, which was large, precious and weighty; and the day following was the women's meeting, which also was large and very solemn. These two meetings being for ordering the affairs of the church, many weighty things were opened and communicated to them by way of advice, information and instruction. In these two meetings, several men's and women's meetings for other parts (subordinate meetings) were agreed and settled, to take care of the poor, and other affairs of the

church, and to see that all who profess the truth walk according to the glorious gospel of God. When this great general meeting in Rhode Island was ended, it was somewhat hard for Friends to part; for the glorious power of the Lord which was over all and His blessed truth and life flowing amongst them had so knit and united them together, that they spent two days in taking leave one of another, and of the Friends of the island; and then being mightily filled with the presence and power of the Lord, they went away with joyful hearts to their various habitations in the several colonies where they lived.*

At this time, and for a hundred years following, the Friends were a very prominent factor in the government of the colony.

William Coddington, who was foremost among the founders of the Rhode Island Colony, Nicholas Easton, who built the first house in Newport, Walter Clarke, who saved the Charter of the colony in the Andros crisis, John Easton who plead with King Philip to try arbitration instead of war, were some of the members of this yearly meeting who were governors during the early years. Altogether Friends occupied the governor's chair for thirty-five terms and the deputy governorship for many more times—one Friend, Walter Clarke, being deputy governor continuously for fourteen terms. Governor John Wanton, who was one of the leading Quaker preachers of his period and who sat in the ministers' gallery in a bright scarlet cloak was seven times governor and four times deputy governor. Stephen Hopkins, one of the greatest figures in the colonial period of Rhode Island, who was nine times governor, for many years chief-justice of the colony, one of the greatest exponents of the American doctrine of no taxation without representation, a delegate to all the colonial congresses, and a signer of the Declaration of Independence, was a Friend until 1774 when he was disowned for possessing a single slave. It will, therefore, be seen that Quakerism in those times was a very live affair and that the members of this yearly meeting were persons of weight and influence in the world of events.

Until 1695 this yearly meeting included all Friends on Long Island and on "the mainland" of New York, as the early records call it, so that from far away Piscataqua in the East to

* Journal II, pp. 168–169.

the little metropolis on Manhattan Island in the West, Friends came up to the great annual feast. Almost every year there were visiting ministers present from England and also from the new and wonderful Philadelphia, from Maryland, Virginia and the Carolinas and occasionally from Barbadoes and the other West Indies to which *we* now send missionaries! In 1695 the following minute was adopted, which set off for the first time in history one yearly meeting from its parent body: "It is agreed that ye meeting at Long Island shall be from this time a Yearly Meeting, and that John Boune and John Rodman shall receive all such as come to ye Yearly Meeting in Long Island and correspond with friends in London."

Four years later, in 1699, this yearly meeting adopted the plan of having representatives attend from the subordinate meetings, as the following minute indicates: "It is agreed by order and consent of this Meeting, that the second day of the week be for the business and service of the meeting for the future, according to ye ancient order of Truth amongst us, and not for public worship, and that two friends from each Quarterly Meeting, and where no Quarterly Meeting, two from each Monthly Meeting, to attend ye service of ye Yearly Meeting, till business is ended, and as many other sober friends as hath freedom." The following year, in 1700, the meeting of ministers and elders was first organized, though at that date the term "elder" was not used. The minute reads: "It is agreed upon by this meeting that ye sixth day morning of ye Yearly Meeting, before ye public meeting for worship begins, shall be for ye future for Friends of ye ministry to meet together, and such other *sober Friends* as hath freedom." These "sober Friends" later came to be known as "elders." In 1701 twelve "Queries" were adopted to discover the state of society and to form a sort of silent confessional for the individual members. The custom of preparing formal answers to these "Queries," however, did not begin until 1755.

In spite of the fact that travel was slow and difficult in those quiet days before the railroad, or even before the stage coach, great multitudes of Friends flocked to yearly meeting. John Fothergill attended it in 1722 and he reports that there were two thousand present, and, what is more important still, he says

that "there was a demonstration of the eternal power of God and a confirmation of many souls." Edmund Packover, an interesting English Friend, was in attendance of the yearly meeting in 1743 and he says that there were not less than five thousand persons present. He writes in his Journal: "I never was at so large a meeting before—a most solemn weighty awful (*i. e.* awe-inspiring) time. People from 150 miles to the Eastward came to it." That means that Maine was already beginning to be heard from!

The next great visit in the ministry was that of Samuel Fothergill. His "concern" for this visit had been upon his mind for ten years and he came just after New England had been swept by what is still known as the "Great Religious Awakening," led by George Whitefield and Jonathan Edwards. Samuel Fothergill was a man of great culture and refinement, but also of marked humility and simplicity. He had passed through a deep experience, his religion was of the first-hand kind, and when he spoke he carried *conviction* with his message. He says that New England yearly meeting at the time of his visit (1755) had the largest attendance of any yearly meeting in the world, and that the power of it brought the deepest reverence upon his soul and tears of joy and comfort to his eyes, and he makes this comment upon the yearly meeting of 1755: "The Great Name spread afresh."

One of the most memorable sessions of this body was that held in 1760. John Woolman, a beloved disciple of liberty, and one of the most consummate flowers of Quaker sainthood, was present, "in bowedness of spirit," to use his quaint words, and "measurably bapitzed into a feeling of the state of Society." These were days when Friends of wealth and station in Newport and along the Narragansett shore held slaves and even traded in them. As the meeting was about to begin, John Woolman heard that a cargo of Africans had just arrived at the Newport dock and that they were being sold by a member of the meeting. When he heard this fact he could not eat or sleep and his whole sensitive being felt the shock. Finally, "under deep exercise," he opened his mind in the meeting and pointed out how the deep-seated malady of slave-holding was affecting the spirit of life among Friends and how there was no healing possible without

the removing of the evil. His words, weighted, as they were, with the power of a blameless and consecreted spirit, reached the *quick* of the meeting and wrought a silent revolution, so that within fifteen years from that date the skirts of New England Friends were clean of this ancient stain.

I shall mention only one more event out of the far past—and that shall be a victorious mission of love. When the storm of war broke between the colonies and the mother country—for a brief period a misguided "mother"—Friends of this yearly meeting, under the direction of the Meeting for Sufferings which was established in 1775, undertook to relieve the sufferings occasioned by the siege of Boston. The committee gathered what was for that time an enormous sum—nineteen hundred and sixty-eight pounds sterling—and went out as a kind of eighteenth century Red Cross Society to supply victuals and wood and clothes to those who were in a state of want in and about Boston. In Salem, for instance, these Friends in company with the selectmen of the town went from house to house and distributed relief through the very streets along which Quakers had been whipped at the cart's tail a century before and Salem twice gave Friends "a vote of thanks" for their generous help. So does love conquer and open the way for truth.

Time does not allow today for me to review the modern period of our history with its checkered story. Here we are a little band of four thousand Friends, on the narrow ridge between the past and the future.

> "No mortal ever dreams
> That the scant isthmus he encamps upon
> Between two oceans, one, the Stormy, passed.
> And one, the Peaceful, yet to venture on,
> Has been that future whereto prophets yearned
> For the fulfilment of earth's cheated hope;
> Shall be that past which nerveless poets moan
> As the lost opportunity of song."

It is for us to highly resolve that this "scant isthmus" of a present shall not be looked back upon as a "lost opportunity." Twelve young men and women—the argonauts of the *Woodhouse*"—planted the seed here in great faith; and in vision

saw it spreading as the sand of the sea in multitude. They came to their task expecting to suffer for their consecration to the truth, and ready to endure whatever might be laid upon them in the line of their mission. The tale of their suffering and endurance and that of their converts is almost beyond belief in this easy and comfortable generation. They lay in unspeakably bad jails, they were beaten with tarred ropes and knotted cords, they were kept without food or warmth, they were despoiled of their goods, they were branded with hot irons, they had their ears cropped off, they were banished on pain of death, they were whipped upon the bare back at the cart's tail through town after town, and four of them went to a martyr's death on the scaffold. One of them, whose martyr dust still mingles with the soil of Boston Common, wrote from his prison: "The Lord filled me with living strength and power from His heavenly Presence, which did mightily overshadow me."

Let that spirit and that experience once more arise among us and once again the seed will spread. It is no wonder that great things happened when a spectator could write of a yearly meeting: "There was a demonstration of the eternal power of God and a confirmation of many souls." We can "take the future" only if once more there comes in our lives and in our meetings "a demonstration of the eternal power of God." There is little to be expected from a religion which has fallen to the level of habit and routine, which runs only by the waning momentum of the past. Power, promise, and prophesy of the future belong only to movements which are dynamic with first-hand experience and conviction. What we need is not more machinery, but better contact with the *living current.*

We must feel the burdens of suffering humanity, we must be deeply touched by the problems of sin and poverty, we must realize anew that upon us is laid the task of carrying to this world about our door the gospel of redemption and reconstruction. And with that *call* and a dedication to it must come, too, a new and fresh revelation in our souls of the present Christ, still revealing the amazing love and patience of God, the Love that will not let go, still exhibiting the transforming energy of Grace, and still demonstrating that all things are possible when the Divine Power finds a good human organ to work through.

THE MISSION OF A MESSAGE

The mission of a message is to accomplish the will of the sender. This means that it shall not only reach the intended destination, but that it shall produce the desired result.

"For as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth and maketh it bring forth and bud, and giveth seed to the sower and bread to the eater; so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it." (Isaiah 55: 10–11.) This Scripture has been often quoted as applying to the message of Quakerism, and in the rise of our Society the word was verified and thousands accepted the message and proved their loyalty thereto by devoted lives and triumphant deaths. There is a very general feeling that we of this generation are not meeting our obligations as messengers to the world about us, as those pioneers in our faith met theirs; and this fact gives rise to many questions which are perfectly legitimate and which it is our duty to answer.

Only recently my husband received a letter of the following import from a member of a Friends' meeting in a western state: "The young people of our meeting are asking why it is necessary for us to maintain a separate organization? Why not unite with some of the larger and more influential churches and thus make our lives count for more in the Christianization of the world? The Y. M. C. A and its mission appeals to them and they argue that work in it is as truly Christian service as that done in our own church. What answer can be made to these things? I want help."

This condition is not confined to the West, but is a quite prevalent consideration in the minds of young people who wish to make their lives count for as much as is possible. They have a perfect right to ask such questions if there is no answer for them in their own minds. The time was when the weight of Friendly Authority would have suppressed such queries as a kind of heresy. The subject was not open for discussion, the

questioners would have been regarded as subjects for discipline. That day is past and we must meet such issues squarely or back down and give up the battle. It seems to me that there is a very grave fault back of this condition, not in the questioners but in the comprehension by the church itself as to the nature and the development of our gospel message.

A study of the early days of our denomination fills one with wonder and admiration at the results of the preaching and the teaching of those devoted men and women. The word did not return void, but accomplished that whereunto it was sent, and thousands were added to the church.

I do not know that a comparison of periods is any less odious than a comparison of persons, and I do not believe that in the truest sense it is a profitable undertaking; but the contrast of this ingathering with the very slow increase, and in some instances the steady decrease, of the denomination in our day has a discouraging effect upon the bouyant, enthusiastic spirit of youth. Again and again I hear the remark that the Friends have had their day and done their work, fulfilled their mission; that their work has been great, but that it is now superseded and that the work today can be better done by other churches. This arises from the same want of comprehension of the meaning of our message, resulting from the static, expansionless interpretation too often placed upon the message by the church itself. The occasional comments in the public press upon the decline of the Society and the allusions of the ministers of other churches to this same fact have also a discouraging effect. A few years ago Sam Jones while preaching in High Point, North Carolina, was discussing the methods of different churches, and when he came to the Friends, said: "There is the Society of Friends. They have built a nice church here. My, but isn't that a pretty house! But what do they do? They are fine people; no better people, but they *do* nothing." This was certainly not true of that particular meeting; for it has done more for the civic improvement of that rapidly growing town than almost any other church in it. Its members are alive to every public issue and always on the side of better conditions.

I give this instance to show the general opinion and at the same time to show that sometimes these judgments which irri-

tate and discourage are in reality without foundation and are made at random, because the methods of Friends are quiet and undemonstrative. Other instances of a like nature might be cited. The stubborn fact remains, however, that we are not adding thousands to our membership; that we are not effectively carrying our message. Those early Friends would not be satisfied with our results.

In a careful study of the mission of a message three things are to be considered—the sender, the message, and the people to whom the message is to be carried; and it will help us in this consideration to look carefully at all three in the two periods to which I have alluded,—the time of Fox and our own day, and then, if we can, probe to the cause of our failure to reach our own time as he and his coadjutors reached their time. We may say that in both the sender is the same, God the same yesterday, today, forever. Doubtless this is true, and yet is our idea of God the same? To different peoples God has been almost every kind of a being. To the Jews he was a tribal divinity delighting in the slaughter of their enemies; and to the men of Fox's time a God of vengeance and wrath in whose name heretics were burned at the stake and witches tortured. Fox himself believed in witches and wizards and a God who could and would by fiat change the order of his universe. If I am not mistaken, our ideas of God are not the same as those of George Fox. At any rate, we now recognize the fact that God's revelation of his will is a progressive revelation, and that what was once considered the word of his mouth would not now be recognized as a message from Him, not because of change in Him, but because of change in our conception of Him;

> "For humanity sweeps onward.
> Where today the martyr stands
> On the morrow crouches Judas
> With the silver in his hands."

This development in the mind of man can but be the result of the operations of God's own Spirit drawing humanity onward toward that "One far off divine event to which the whole creation moves," under the operation of which Spirit still greater changes may be confidently expected.

Any message which is to abide these changes and still prove itself a minister to growth and not a shell in which truth is repressed must have within itself the God-given power of perennial expansion. The creed of one generation becomes the chrysalis of the next, and unless the old outer husk is broken and left behind, the living creature there enshrouded must perish. The chrysalis is not the sacred thing: the sacred thing is the living creature within. Our God is the same eternal power as our father's God, but His message to us is not conveyed in the same manner as it was to them three hundred years ago.

The people of the seventeenth century were in bondage not only to their own sins, but to the civil and ecclesiastical authority. They were ignorant; they were hemmed in by superstition, and the church was intolerant. That most awful doctrine —the doctrine of election, the salvation of the few and the hopeless damnation of the many—was promulgated by the followers of Calvin. Politically the common man was a nonentity, and religiously, a sheep without a shepherd. The clergy was largely composed of men unqualified for the situation who were given the position for their own sake to provide them a living; often immoral, teaching by rote and relying upon the ritual, the ceremonial and the ordinances of the church, without spiritual light or knowledge, blind leaders of the blind, incapable of giving a struggling soul assistance because they knew nothing of spiritual exercise.

We cannot imagine what a burst of light and gladness would come through such a message as that of Fox to people thus kept from their birthright. He says, "When the Lord God and his Son Jesus Christ sent me forth into the world to preach his everlasting gospel and kingdom, I was glad that I was commanded to turn people to that inward light, spirit and grace by which all might know their salvation and their way to God, even that Divine Spirit which would lead them into all truth and which I infallibly knew would never deceive any." In this Fox had the germ of perennial expansion, but he had also the microbe of human infallibility which was destined to take a prodigious growth and work much damage and has resulted too often in that most deplorable and deadening thing, *separation*. He called them away from rite and ceremony, from priest and

prelate, to the life of Christ in the soul of man. He showed them that the doctrine of election was a theologian's decree and was not God's order. He turned them from a reliance on the outward to the cherishing and development of the inward and opened anew for every one the glorious possibility of that Sonship for which the Christ had lived and labored, suffered and died, and which the church had buried beneath its corrupt hierarchy and soulless ceremonial.

The message of Fox was a message of life and light, a message of the worth and boundless possibilities of every human soul. It was a message of deliverance from sin and of the power to withstand temptation. It made the struggle of life worth while, and the trials of life stepping stones to greater things.

In that day this doctrine led to certain customs which were exponents of the central truth (I know of no place where these are more clearly and concisely set forth than in the preface to George Fox's Journal, by William Penn), such as their forms of dress and address, their non-observance of ordinances, refusal to pay tithes or bear arms, their way of marriage, their method of preaching the gospel, etc., things familiar to us all from our childhood. Penn says that "The purport of their ministry and doctrine was for the most part what other professors of Christianity pretend to hold in words and forms, but not in Godliness"; and one of the great contrasts was that "They were changed men themselves before they went about to change others. Their hearts were rent as well as their garments changed, and they knew the power and work of God upon them. This was seen by the great alteration it made and the stricter course of life and more Godly conversation that immediately followed it." "The bent and stress of their ministry was conversion to God, regeneration and holiness, not schemes of doctrines and verbal creeds or new forms of worship; but a leaving off in religion the superfluous and reducing the ceremonious and formal part and pressing earnestly the substantial, the necessary and profitable part. And truly they waxed strong and bold through faithfulness and by the power and Spirit of the Lord Jesus became very fruitful: thousands in a short time being turned to the truth through their testimony in ministry and sufferings in so much as in most counties and many considerable towns of England

meetings were settled, and daily there were added such as should be saved."

Because of its relation to their message and its significance to our own time, it is also necessary to speak of their attitude towards the Holy Scriptures.

Concerning this I find the most concise statement in Barclay's "Apology." It is rather a long quotation, but as it is all needed to define their position, I give it:—

"From these revelations of the Spirit of God to the saints have proceeded the Scriptures of truth, which contain,

"I. A faithful historical account of the actings of God's people in divers ages; with many singular and remarkable providences attending them.

"II. A prophetical account of several things, whereof some are already past, and some yet to come.

"III. A full and ample account of all the chief principles of the doctrine of Christ, held forth in divers precious declarations, exhortations and sentences, which, by the movings of God's Spirit, were at several times, and upon sundry occasions, spoken and written unto some churches and their pastors.

"Nevertheless, because they are only a declaration of the fountain, and not the fountain itself, therefore they are not to be esteemed the principal ground of all truth and knowledge, nor yet the adequate primary rule of faith and manners. Yet because they give a true and faithful testimony of the first foundation, they are and may be esteemed a secondary rule, subordinate to the Spirit, from which they have all their excellency and certainty: for as by the inward testimony of the Spirit we do alone truly know them, so they testify, That the Spirit is that Guide by which the saints are led into all Truth; therefore, according to the Scriptures, the Spirit is the first and principal leader. Seeing then that we do therefore receive and believe the scriptures because they proceeded from the Spirit, for the very same reason is the Spirit more originally and principally the rule, according to the received maxim in the schools: That for which a thing is such, that thing itself is more such."

I have quoted this to show that in the original position of Friends there was a foundation which remains unmolested by modern Biblical study.

Contrast with the age of King Charles and Oliver Cromwell, Bishop Laud and George Fox our own day. The learning which was confined to the clergy and the scholar in that day is the possession of the ordinary schoolboy in our own time. Public education is everywhere insisted upon, and scientific investigation has brought to light and explained many facts which were sealed with seven or more seals to Fox and Penn. The science of the human mind and soul has opened vast fields of knowledge and more of speculation, and the laws of the subconscious life have made people more careful in claiming infallible divine guidance than they once were. People care little for creeds and formulas and more for their fellow men. We have no faith in witches or wraiths and no patience for witch hunters, and little belief in visions. Even the unchurched masses of whom we hear so much would not listen to sermons upon election. And yet there are millions of slaves in our free land, millions who are so bound down by toil and greed and sin that they have little hope in this life and care less for that which is to come. There are sweat-shops and factories of every kind where men and women and children are trampled underfoot by the car of material wealth. Man's inhumanity to man denies the bond of Sonship of God and brotherhood of men. On the other hand, personal salvation is no longer the ultimate aim of any life which is worth living. The salvation of society is the watchword, and the individualistic characteristics of the Friends must be expanded if the work of freedom is to be carried on. There is a grand field for Christian effort and philanthropic zeal, and we of all people ought to be the ones to carry it forward, and reach the people, fortunate and unfortunate, with messages of brotherhood. Are we ready? And if not, what hinders us?

It is not a pleasant task to point out defects. We have been so accustomed to hear ourselves praised and the great deeds and greater influences set forth that any one who pictures a different view cannot but seem ungracious and unappreciative. I can only set forth what appeals to me as some of the reasons, quite aware at the same time that when one stops to analyze the immediate prospects, one is more than likely to miss the cosmic sweep of events and lose the greater in the less.

That some of the influences which I consider hindrances may have had some ulterior purpose and effect, and in these unknown respects have had beneficent results, I will not attempt to deny, because religious truth advances by a zigzag journey and not in a direct line.

After our great ingathering, we did just as the Catholic Church did—allowed our forms to encrust us. We insisted upon maintaining the temporal branches from the root, and while these were goodly for their time because they were instruments for the emancipation of the human soul, some became obsolete, and meaningless to an age in which any one was at liberty to follow his own conscience.

Our tendency to adhere to external form of Fox's day, even to the subversion of his idea of personal liberty, has often reminded me of a schoolboy experience of my father. His position was at the foot of the spelling class when the teacher gave out the word turkey. Down the line it came—t e r k e y, t a r k e y, t u r k y, etc., but when it reached him he spelled t u r k e y and proceeded to march to the head of the class. The next word went down the line and came to him at the head of the class. T u r k e y he spelled, trusting to the word that had carried him up, and losing his place as a consequence. The policy of the Society of Friends appears to me to have been exactly the same.

Under this repression of authority multitudes left the Society, married out or were disowned for some trivial offence; and while there was much sincere religion and love of the brethren and of the world, there was practiced an extremely individualistic form of Christianity.

The idea of personal infallibility, undoubtedly fostered by Fox, bore fruit in many divergent doctrines and changes in the form of worship. The exaggeration of certain phases of belief, coupled with the unyielding conscience of men, sure of their own perception of the leading of the Lord, gave rise to separations which are the chief hindrance to an effective deliverance of our message to the world. Instead of a united people carrying the glad tidings to those about us, we present the anomalous position of Friends contending with each other. What salutary effect this may have upon ourselves I do not pretend to know; but I am quite confident that it is a great source of weakness so

far as relates to our appeal to thoughtful people outside, and even inside, our own ranks.

If we could only unite and quit doubting one another, and stop fighting one another, we might accomplish wonders in this generation.

Another effect which militates against the promulgation of our message is the condition of the great majority of our ministers; for many of them, while filled with the love of the gospel and held in high esteem, are persons of little education and small comprehension of the needs of our own time; and while I fully believe that Oxford and Cambridge are not indispensable to the call to preach, I do believe that a well trained and a well stored mind is a powerful aid in bringing the gospel to the people. Perhaps its chief advantage is that it enables ministers to know *what not to say* occasionally. Facts revealed by scientific investigation are sacred truths. They are God's order, discovered by following His methods. Man is a rising being, created an animal he has breathed in the spirit which is lifting him from the animal appetites and passions into a fellowship with God. To this life of triumph Christ is the door. He opened the way to a living, personal, experimental relation to God, the Father of the Spirit.

In the 8th chapter of Romans, Paul gives us a very clear statement of the truth:—"For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only so, but ourselves also, who have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body. For the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God. So then, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh: for if ye live after the flesh, ye must die; but if by the Spirit ye put to death the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are the sons of God."

Our ministers need to know science, and not argue against what they do not understand. It is not necessary to preach evolution nor higher criticism, because the love of God as manifest in Jesus Christ our Lord and the redemption from sin are universal needs: but it is necessary, if our message is to reach

this age, to take scientific facts for granted and not preach against them.

There is a prophetic ministry which, when truly baptized, is the most edifying and uplifting form of ministry, and should be encouraged; but in most places we need also a teaching ministry which shall be able to meet the questions and perplexities of our own time, and for this we need educated men and women, men and women who understand both the nature of our message and its adaptation to the present crisis in the religious world.

Another hindrance to our message bearing is the fact that as a denomination we have never learned to contribute liberally to work of the church. Individuals amongst us have been most liberal, generous and benevolent, but their very generosity has made the rank and file willing to allow the few to bear the burdens and do the work of the church while they themselves excuse themselves and hold on to their silver. We have been so impressed with the freedom of the gospel that we are in danger of becoming free from the gospel. If we are to teach others to help save society and the world, we must have ministers to do much of the teaching who are not encumbered with the necessity of providing a living.

Perhaps the saddest and most far-reaching cause of our failure is to be found in our own love of ease and freedom from responsibility. We have become so accustomed to let "Concerned Friends" bear the burden and the heat of the day, while we enjoy the eminently reputable position of members of the Society of Friends and rejoice in a kind of religious cultured ease, that when the time comes for every one to buckle on the armor and exert himself for the extension of the Kingdom of God, we are nerveless and irresolute. Is it a want of that burning, loving loyalty to God and man, which was the mainspring of our forefathers' zeal, which paralyzes us? If so, we must arouse ourselves. We need not preach from wash-tubs, as some of our forebears in the church did, but we can open closed meeting houses and gather in the children and teach them the Way of Life. A message such as ours is the very word which needs to be spoken to this age, distracted by its myriad voices and oppressive doubts. Scientific fact does not disturb him who knows that God is One and that His spirit is in all His works. There

is no fear for the Bible, because it, too, has its foundation in Him.

The old barriers which prevented our people from uniting with their fellow Christians in efforts for amelioration of suffering and eradication of evil have happily long ago disappeared, and one of the open doors for service is that which invites co-operation with other churches, and yet there is a reason for the maintenance of a separate church. To what church could a young Friend go, if he be a thoughtful conscientious Friend? He must in the outset undergo some form of ritual in which he has no faith; and while in all the deeper phases of the Christian life there is a unity in the churches, in these external testimonies, as well as in some matters of more vital import, there is a difference which calls for us in the family of churches. "The world still needs its Quaker."

The Y. M. C. A. is a great and beneficent institution and one specially attractive to our young people because of its generous inclusiveness. But it is not a church, and particularly emphasizes the fact that it is not. It does not reach that phase of life which is the special mission of the church—the family and the home, so it cannot sever our church connections, but should make us more loyal.

If one thinks the Society of Friends has done its work, let one look abroad and survey the work which is yet to be done and see whether the mission of our message has yet been accomplished and gird one's self to do one's part in carrying it on until the souls and bodies of men are free, and women bow no longer beneath the burdens of their own and other people's sins, and the little children have what is the God-given but man-destroyed right of childhood—leisure and play and learning and happiness and comfortable homes.

In the testing times which are upon us and which are destined to increase rather than diminish, a church with the message of spiritual reality and the possible union of the human and divine in every life; in short, with the message which our Quaker faith makes possible, is the church which "in the maddening maze of things" may comfort the quailing thought and bring relief to the storm-tossed, which may in the words of Isaiah quoted by Jesus, preach good tidings unto the meek and

bind up the broken hearted, proclaim liberty to the captives, the opening of the prison to them that are bound, and proclaim the year of Jehovah's favor. The original message was not in its detail just what would suit our age, but it did contain as others did not that vital developing norm which, if we had but been true to our own evolutionary principle, would have made us in this age a fearless people. This cloud of suspicion and doubt and hesitation which enshrouds such a large part of the Christian church needs the dispelling power of our message. Men are afraid of this teacher and that; afraid of this doctrine and that; afraid that something is going to destroy the Bible. What has a church to fear whose whole polity is based upon Eternal Love, and the perfect knowledge exemplified in life and conduct, that we are heirs of God and joint heirs of Jesus Christ.

"The letter fails and systems fall
And every symbol wanes;
The Spirit over-brooding all
Eternal love remains."

And there is no fear to those who are rooted and grounded in this truth, and we might well go forth with the message, "Behold we bring you glad tidings of great joy."

In the past we have discovered that separations settle nothing and generate weakness; that wholesale disownments are contrary to the law of inclusive love; that science is of God, and that a scientific fact is as sacred as a moral principle; that fear is the worst heresy; that, in spite of our misconception and our failures, God's Spirit is with His children. With this experience and with the sunshine of His love and grace upon us, the time is propitious for us to gird ourselves anew, and, with Him as leader, who was never foiled in battle, press with fresh vigor for the enlargement of His Kingdom.

MARY MENDENHALL HOBBS.

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR POTHIER OF RHODE ISLAND

Governor Pothier's address was an interesting appreciation of Quaker influence on Rhode Island Citizenship.

OUR FIRST YEARLY MEETING

Let mem'ry turn for us the leaves of life's old book
Till once again on dream-kissed page of youth we look.
When first we joined the armies of the Lord, and heard
The world-wide discord, sin's Philistine army stirred,
And saw that giant Greed, grown great on pandery,
Like old Goliath, virtue's feeble host defy;
How burned our hearts with zeal to slay the monster then,
Make virtue triumph and bring Godly peace to men!
Our *faith* and *hope* and *will* seemed pebble weapons meet
To bring the world reformed to our dear Master's feet.
How oft we posed, in thought, as Michael with bright blade
At heart of prostrate Evil! We were ne'er afraid
The task might prove too great, our arm too impotent,
Never a doubt of victory, since with God we went.
Such fiery zeal and faith in early Friends we see;
That crisis of our race's youth, its spiritual puberty;
When England's Parliament, for two long months debates
If in James Nayler Christ or Satan dominates;
When rapt George Fox with awful power of God did quake
And shook men's souls till firm earth seemed to shake;
When men had time to spend long days in wordy strife,
And for the Life within, men scorned the outward life.
How grandly fearless and how stiff those God-filled men!
And how this shifty age needs just such faith again!

Not in these cloistered groves of studious ease,
  Where quiet meditation woos the soul
Did our forefathers meet, but where the sea's
  Strong waves on wild Aquidneck loudly roll.

Not in these times of peace, when, conscience free,
  All men may think and worship as they will,
But while the martyr fight for liberty
  Round Boston's "bloody den" was raging still.

And yet how deep the peace those fathers knew,
  How clear they heard the still small voice of God,
And how the Light within still brighter grew,
  As they remained obedient to the Word.

In New England's month of flowers,
  Sixteen hundred sixty one,
On the Isle of Aquiday,
  Our yearly meeting was begun.

Then from all the country round,
  In their boats or through the wood,
Thronged the Quakers old and young
  At the call of Rofe, the good.

Up from Salem came the seed,
  From Boston, Roxbury, and Lynn,
Duxbury, Sandwich, Providence Friends
  All led by the Light within.

Coddington, Coggeshall, Easton and Clarke
  Lovingly welcomed the pilgrims there,
Opened their houses, opened their hearts,
  Hunted and whipped find refuge here.

Under the trees and in the house
  Gather the people unto the Lord,
Seekers and sufferers peace find at last,
  Filled with the Spirit, fed on the Word.

Epistles were read from English Friends:
  "Edward Burrough sendeth word
Charles has promised that vein to stop
  Of innocent blood now flowing abroad.

Shattuck of Salem will soon arrive
  With missive to muzzle their cruel law;
Friends take courage and spread the truth,
  Unstopped of the halter or prison's maw.

George Fox and seven hundred Friends,
  Set free by Charles, rejoice in God,
Whose power triumphing over all
  Thus breaks the persecutor's rod."

Our Martyrs not in vain had died,
  Wharton and Christison, just set free,
With a score from Boston jail
  Are here to sing their jubilee.

Edward Wharton, Leddra's friend,
  Who, banished, still with Leddra stayed,
From the scaffold caught his clay,
  Tenderly the burial made;

Now his friend's last message reads,
  Written just before he died,
"To the little Flock of Christ"
  Followers of the crucified.

"Joy of the Lord so fills my house"
  My soul no longer dwells in clay
"Sweet influence of the Morning Star"
  Bears it in eternal love away.

Of the other martyred Friends
  Daniel Gould had much to tell,
"Sweet and heavenly sayings" of theirs,
  While he shared their prison cell.

How hand in hand that joyful three
  Went to Boston Common, there
Glad to die to make truth free,
  And thus the way of God prepare.

Triumphant and content they go,
  "This day we shall rest in God,"
Faith unshaken, Vision splendid!
  Such joy ends not neath the sod.

Mary Dyer, on the scaffold,
  Hears "reprieved" almost with pain.
"In the Lord's good will I came here
  In His will I would remain."

In vain her son now bears her home,
  In vain her husband's love and prayer,
Ever her spirit feels the call
  To rescue Friends or with them share.

Next Spring again in that same work,
  "Your laws repeal, my earnest prayer"
She faced her stern judge, Endicott,
  And died, heroic, Christlike, there.

Devotion such as this was felt
  Through all the commonwealth, and so
E'en Endicott was glad to let
  The prisoned Quakers freely go.

And Wenlock Christison, condemned
  To die this very month, is here
To tell how sweet the peace that fills
  Death-waiting cell when Christ is there.

Martyr fires and Altar coals
  Warm the heart and touch the head,
Christ is there to Grace the feast
  And many pass the broken bread.

Thus burning messages were given
  By those whom suffering had made whole,
Spirit and power flowing through them
  Knit the Friends there soul to soul.

In love and unity they part
  Promising each year's return;
Each carries home a glowing heart
  And zeal for God, of knowledge born.

Let us who bear the *name* of Friends
  Possess their *spirit, courage, faith,*
Their *zeal* to do his will, and hear
  "Ye *are* my *Friends,*" the Master saith.

W. S. Meader.

THE RELIGIOUS DISCOVERIES OF GEORGE FOX

Edward Caldwell Moore

We are accustomed to think of religion as a conservative force in human society. Religious institutions have shown themselves perhaps, on the whole, the most immobile of institutions. Religious movements have tended to crystallize more quickly than have movements of almost any other kind which I should be able to name. Their deposit, once it has been made, has resisted more successfully than has any other the all-dissolving process of time. Religious reformations, even where they have worn, for a time, the aspect of revolution, as of course they often have done, present the almost uniform phenomenon of speedy arrest. Their new maxims, at first asserted as liberties, have been quickly transformed into principles of authority. The same man, who was, in his youth, the prophet of a new era, persecutes, in his age, the prophets who come after him. A rite or ceremony of worship, originally natural and transparent, becomes conventional. Yet it persists unaltered and unalterable far into the period of the clarifying and exalting of the religious sentiment. Scarcely anything is so persistent as ritual.

One may verify these statements from the history of Buddhism and from that of the rise of Mohammedanism. One may illustrate them from the careers of many of the Protestant reformers and from the history of the Protestant sects, as truly as from that of the Greek or Roman Catholic churches. The French revolutionaries felt that the normal condition of religion was that of resistance to progress. They found no difference on this point between Gallicans and Jesuits. The learned, the politically mobile, the socially enthusiastic, stand in much the same attitude towards the Church in France today. There may be reason for this in the position which the Roman Church has taken as over against Modernism. But even in England and America, where there are surely fewer causes of tension and embitterment, the indifference at the present

moment to Church and religion has at least one main root in the sense of the stationariness of religion. The notion is widespread among peoples possessed—not to say obsessed—with the ideal of progress that religion is not only not one of the causes of progress, but is unable even to keep the pace of progress which the other factors of civilization set. Of it in many minds the prophet's word is true: "Its strength is to sit still."

Not merely is this, which I have been saying, true of religion as it has expressed itself in institutions, customs and practices. The same fact may be illustrated from the history of thought. Religion as expressed in doctrines and dogmas has tended in preëminent, and most would say in absolutely characteristic fashion to become and to remain stationary. It has constituted at times a very serious hindrance to advance in all other departments of thought.

The great historic religions have always received their formative and, again, their reforming impulses from epoch-making personalities, like those of Moses, Gautama, Jesus, Mohammed. But it has been a standing trait in their development that dicta of these revered personalities have ceased to be spirit and life—to borrow one of Jesus' phrases. They have ceased to be spirit and life, as He warned men that His words were to be. They have become mere dicta, literal and verbal oracles. To these not in their inward sense but in their very phrasing authority has attached. Exactly that which Jesus denounced the Scribes for doing with the words of Moses, His own disciples and their disciples did with His.

Jesus Himself spoke so largely the language of religious intuition, the language of imagination and of feeling, of poetry and ethical enthusiasm, that the remark which I am making applies less strictly to His own words than to those of some others. But Paul, besides being a man of intuition, was a thinker. He expressed his religious consciousness in terms of the Rabbis and, again, in terms borrowed from the Greeks. The Fourth Gospel may be said to be completely transfused with Hellenism. The religious magnitude, which Jesus was, a magnitude of incomparable significance, is painted against a background of notions which are historically traceable and of only relative significance.

In very reverence succeeding generations totally confused two things which widely differ. They confounded the documents of revelation with revelation itself. As to creeds and systems, which are but the interpretation of religion in terms of current thought, men have given themselves to that which must seem to an historian the naivest of assumptions, that they were all in consonance, one with another and with the Scriptures. The outside world can hardly be blamed for thinking Christian thought unprogressive. It is this which traditionally Christian thinkers have been most insistent and emphatic in asserting for themselves. No word has been more constantly upon ecclesiastics' lips than that about the faith once delivered to the saints—whereby they usually mean, not the faith, but the statement of the faith. The area of the conventional discussion of religion is the sphere, and one might almost say the only sphere, in which still survives and is potent that which Schelling called the æsthetic prejudice, *viz.* that which is Divine must, by conception, be perfect and unchangeable. In almost all other spheres men have accepted with enthusiasm the idea that the Divinest of all things is the mystery of growth.

When one thinks of the way in which historic formulations of religion, achieved in a remote past, have been lifted out of the relativity which belongs to everything historic, and made the absolute and authoritative external standard for the present and even for a limitless future, one can hardly wonder that men —some men, at all events—have felt that the progress of the world of thought, as well as of life, might be due to almost any other cause, but not to religion.

In the light of all this which we have been saying, it may be surprising to hear so great a man as Hegel say, and that not once but repeatedly, that the religious spirit has been, as a matter of fact, the bearer—"Träger" is his word—the great furtherer—of the life of the spirit of mankind. It has often anticipated the philosophical reflection and scientific discovery of subsequent ages. It has frequently divined that which later generations only were able to prove. It has often asserted with the sublime confidence of true prophecy that which the world had, as yet, no logic to sustain. It has confidently declared

that which flatly contradicted the reflections upon God, man and the world, in which the prophets themselves, being the intellectual children of their own age, indulged.

Between this sentiment of the great idealist and the common notion given above there would seem to be completest contradiction. In reality there is no contradiction at all. All that sharp arraignment had to do only with religion as formulated and organized, with religion in doctrine and institution; while that which Hegel says, has to do with religion itself as distinguished from any and all of its manifestations. It has to do with religion itself as interior and personal experience, as purely spiritual magnitude, ever freeing itself from passing and partial embodiments, ever entering into new and living manifestations, ever laying aside its old garments, or, in Paul's yet profounder image, ever dying that it may rise again.

But while it is thus clear that there is here no contradiction, that both Hegel's praise and the current blame remain, each in its own way true, yet certainly we have here suggested a most startling comparision of that which Christianity has often been with that which it might have been and ought to be. I say Christianity, because it is easiest to illustrate my truth from the religion which we all know most about. But I could draw my examples quite as well from the Old Testament, and the propositions would be equally true of Buddhism or of the Mohammedan faith. Or, perhaps, I might put it in this way. The comparison is not between that which religion, alas! has too often been, and that splendid thing which it might have been. Thus to put it is to lack insight. The true assertion is that the same religion, Christianity or any other, has been, by the very law of its being, both of these things at the same time, in the same place and to some at least of the same persons. It has been both of these things at all times and in all prophetic souls. It has been and is, to any man, both wing and fetter. It has been both help and hindrance, both the furtherer and the retarder of the great aims and gains of humanity.

Religion without expression tends ever to vanish into thin air. It has no means of propagating itself. It has scarcely even power to sustain itself. But let it find its expression,

and this expression tends ever to become stereotyped. People arise who confound the expression or application with the religion. It has been often the very love of religion which led a man to break away from its forms. But when he does thus break away, he must sooner or later make new forms or lapse into irreligion. When he does thus make new forms he often forecasts, in a sheer unmeditated insight which seems to belong to great religious experience, the course of ordered thought or rational endeavor which the race at large will actually follow long after the seer has been numbered with the dead.

The most dramatic example is, of course, Jesus Himself. What a tragedy it is that the Man of Spirit *par excellence*, of all whom humanity has ever seen, the Man who was always at war with Priests, Pharisees and Scribes, the Man who was continually saying, "The words which I speak unto you, they are spirit and life," the Man who cried, "I am come that they might have life," has had His name associated for almost two thousand years with a system and an institution which has been esteemed—which has largely esteemed itself—as having come to give men doctrines, forms, laws, not life directly, but life only in and through and after these! Equally, however, it must be said that the transcendent glory of Jesus' career and influence lies in this, that, in spite of what we have just said, it is the spirit which He manifested, it is the men who have lived and worked and suffered in the spirit which He showed, it is that spirit, despite often its bondage to inadequate forms, by which not only has the Church itself, ever and anon, been purified, but by which also civilization has been furthered and the world advanced.

So that I come back to my proposition. Not only does religion, but so also does the Church itself possess this double face. Not only may religion be thus contemplated, but in justice it must be contemplated from these two opposing points of view. And every great religious genius is in himself in some proportions made up of these two conflicting elements.

There is perhaps no more striking modern example of our principle than George Fox, the heroic figure who stands at the beginning of the history of Quakerism. It was the thought of Fox's marvelous originality, of his epoch-making assertion of a

few fundamental principles, of his fearless obedience to the Inner Light, which gave me particular impulse to the elaboration of a theme which has long been running in my mind. You have invited me to deliver an address which already, in the sequence of its speakers and subjects, is beoming historic, and which has a peculiar significance for those men and women of thought and faith who have made this institution what it is.

There is, of course, always the possibility of a certain irony in that which Jesus called the building of the tombs of the prophets, in annually putting flowers, or even only flowers of rhetoric, upon those graves. The very context of Jesus' phrase contains a suggestion about the possibility of our doing honor to dead prophets, while we have but stones for living ones. The harking back to the inaugurator of a movement is apt to take place in a moment when the movement is arrested. Yet, if we never did thus pause in veneration for the great who have put us under special obligation, we should show less gratitude than we feel, and manifest less sense of the directive impulse they afforded than we have.

No man's antagonism to the spirit of sectarianism, which was so rife in his time, could have gone farther to guarantee that he, at least, would never be looked upon as the founder of a sect. No man's unfailing emphasis upon the things of the spirit could ever have done more to impress upon those who aspired to be his followers, that that which they were to do in the world was simply to be the bearers of a certain Inner Spirit of Life.

Yet, I repeat that Fox and the early Quaker movement offers a wonderful example of that thing which I am trying to describe, namely, the prophetic quality of real religion, its traits as forerunner of many of the intellectual and even the practical achievements of mankind, its pioneering aspect, its genius for discovery, its prevision, the service which it has rendered as projector of hypotheses ploddingly verified by the far slower intellect of man, as the surmiser of new worlds, which may have been very slow to swim within men's ken.

Let me speak first of Fox's intuitions or, at least, implications in the realm of doctrine, and then, secondly, of those in respect of institutions and of life. Under doctrines let us first think of his relation to Scripture.

I.

Of Fox it was said among his contemporaries that if the Bible had been lost, it could in large part have been reproduced from the memory of Fox. If, therefore, he offered upon occasion new and free interpretation, at all events it could not be said of him that his liberal attitude toward the Scriptures had its main source in the fact that he did not know anything about the Scriptures. Of some liberals whom I know it would be true to say, not so much that they use freedom in dealing with these documents, as that they feel, quite obviously, free not to deal with them. They set up speculations about the content or early history of Christianity as if we had no documents, or as if those which we have were worthy of no serious consideration. But Fox lived in an age and in a land of literal Bible worship. He had been bred in a community in which no one opinion in sacred matters would so surely have been regarded as the foundation of all others, as this, that the Scriptures were verbal oracles, words of God altogether miraculously communicated for the enlightenment and saving of men.

It has often been deplored that Protestants did thus, in their need of an authority, in their struggle with the Church, go over to a notion of the Book which made of it as much a fetish as others had ever made of the tradition of the Church. Historically, it may be doubted whether they could then have sustained themselves had they done otherwise. But at all events there is no question that this is what they did. Language would fail me to describe the mood of literalist superstition on this subject in which men in that era in England found themselves. "The Bible and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants," said Chillingworth, in one of the few phrases of that once illustrious divine, which modern men are now likely to quote. It was a hundred and twenty-five years before Lessing could say, "Doctrine is not religion and the Bible is not Christianity." Lessing wrote a language which few Englishmen of his generation understood. He wrote in the wake of the rationalist movement which the religious among them would have abhorred. Herder is sometimes confident of his principle. But he too has his lapses. The Deists, the more coherent of them, declared that

there could not be any such thing as revelation. That opinion was in large part the basis of the contention for the so-called natural religion. Goethe, on the whole, would have agreed with the Deists. Even Kant, despite his touching reverence for his pietistic ancestry, presents the singular spectacle of one who deeply doubts whether there can be such a thing as revelation, because it seemed to him destructive of freedom. Yet Kant put into our hands a theory of knowledge which is the very key to all our modern ideas of Scripture. By it we find ourselves quite able to conceive a revelation which yet conforms to all the laws of the free life of the mind.

It was Coleridge in England, Erskine in Scotland, and Horace Bushnell in America who in anxious and loving toil wrought out and made current for English-speaking peoples a theory of inspiration, rationally grounded, which yet preserved unimpaired the spiritual values of the intuition of men like George Fox, to which utterance had been given almost two centuries before.

I presume that if George Fox had been asked for his theory of Scripture he would have answered, simply, that he did not live much by theory. At least, that is what an acute observer would have said of him. But if you had pushed him to the wall and forced him to theorize, you would probably have got an abstraction not so widely different from the abstractions which reigned with the other devout souls of his own time. In reality, however, he set his own soul free from the slavery of bibliolaters. He soared above the fanaticisms and bigotries of literalists, dogmatists, fifth-monarchy men, and all those other lurid personages. He felt himself different from even so great a man as Cromwell. Cromwell felt him to be different too. When they drew sword and cried, "Thus saith the Lord," he felt no necessity of even having sword or raising voice. He was perfectly sure that the Lord had spoken to him too. What the Lord had said to him was for him final, no matter what He had said to others, and not even if these others felt they had their revelation, letters and vowel points, *ipsissimis verbis*, in a holy book.

What I am saying is that, in his whole doctrine of the Inner Light and especially in his application of it to the Bible, his

real principles upon which he acted with a resolute and limitless earnestness had as good as no relation to the reflection upon these subjects in which his age or even he himself indulged. They are in all their implications wholly incompatible with any reasoned view current in Fox's day. They are strictly compatible with a view of God and man and their relation, such as has been commonly accepted only in our own time and is not now accepted by vast numbers of people whom we know.

Now, to say that George Fox and his Quakers were somehow proleptically Kantians, that they had dim forecasts of Strauss and the Higher Criticism, would be too preposterous for words. We have not to wonder how they ever guessed at any of the many steps in this long progress of the toiling mind of man. They did not. They jumped to the conclusion without going through the process. They found themselves in the upper story without going up the stairs. The stairs by which the people with less religion get to the same conclusions have been built since their time. The ladder for the solid, irrefragable progression of the reasonings of men has been, later, with vast effort put against the temple to whose pinnacle their souls already soared. If you had asked Fox to prove that what he said was so, he would have been more than embarrassed. The proof, in the ordinary sense of logic, absolutely did not then exist. He might have thought in his humility merely that he did not have it. He did not know enough to know that no man had it. He could not foresee that no man would have it for yet a hundred years. He would have been sore put to it for an argument, unless, possibly, he had bethought himself of that which Jesus used so effectively: "He that doeth My will shall know of the doctrine." Try it and see. "It finds me," in the Coleridgian phrase. The soul answers, "It cannot but be so."

Shall I speak irreverently if I say that we have exactly this same phenomenon in Jesus? The Nazarene was surely brought up in the notions of the devout among His own people upon all that we should call the theoretical aspects of religious truth. For myself, I have not the shadow of a doubt that if Jesus had been called upon to state His theory of revelation, a doctrine of the inspiration of the Old Testament, to which writings

He so obviously attributed in the highest sense Divine quality, He would have said something much like that which the purest souls among the Rabbis of His day were saying. It shows what a definite impression we have of the traits and personality of Jesus, that it is a little remote from us even to imagine Him stating a theory or formulating a dogma. But when we do imagine it, we have to imagine His intellect working much as I said. Paul assuredly was literalist and bibliolater in some of his moods. He loved nothing better than to enunciate dogmas. But Paul's soul—not his mind but his soul—worked just as did that of Jesus and of Fox. The current theory of revelation in Paul's day was what I have called the outward and oracular one, which held with definiteness that God spoke somehow literally, miraculously, to Moses and the prophets, and that these then spoke the mind, or rather the literal words, of God. But if this is true, then it is not the less remarkable that we find Jesus in His own wonderful and authoritative way saying, "Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, etc., but I say unto you . . ."

Jesus nowhere asserts the ancient theory of revelation, although Paul does. Jesus nowhere theoretically criticises it. He nowhere sets up a new one. Theories were not exactly in His line. He simply utters with confidence a religious insight, an intuition which, when it came to be theorized about, reveals itself as having implications which are wholly incompatible with the postulates of Rabbinism, and equally with the principles of Platonism which have obtained in Christendom almost down to our own time.

Again, let me say that nothing could be further from my mind than to suppose that what we have here in Jesus, what we may find in Paul, despite his Rabbinism, in Origen, despite his belief in oracles, what we have in a mystic of the Middle Ages, as over against the tradition of the Church, or in George Fox and the early Quakers, as against the bibliolatry of Puritans, is a kind of subconscious anticipation of modern idealism. When I state that so crassly everybody feels the ridiculousness of the idea. To think that these ancient prophetic souls had visions of the theories of the Copernicans or of the Evolutionists would be the veriest absurdity. And yet they

all—Jesus, most of all—say things in sublime moments of religious elevation, which to our minds fit into the modern theories of knowledge and of the world vastly better than they seem to us to have fitted into the contemporary theory, or to any other theories which have obtained from their time to ours. That only emphasizes what we are saying, how different a thing religion is from any theory about religion, and by what amazing intervals religious insight has outrun reflection. It has carried prophetic souls, literally at a bound, centuries and millenniums beyond the best intellectual life of the human race in their own time. It makes the history of the race to present the spectacle of a long, slow, toilsome, painful struggle to overtake and to confirm, in the way of reasoning to establish, that which the soul long since in the moment of divining elevation had declared.

The implications of such a parable as, for example, that of the Prodigal Son are exactly the opposite of the theory of man, as alien to God until there passes on him the miracle of grace as son of God first, then when he has been converted. The implications of it are that man is in the closest relation conceivable to God, just in being man at all.

This is true quite independently of the fact or measure of his failure to live up to the ideal which that relation demands. It is this relation which makes the failure so tragic. It is this relation which makes the recovery possible. It is this which explains how it is to himself that a man returns when he comes to God. And yet how completely did the notion of the contrariety of God and man, the mutual exclusiveness of the two conceptions, dominate the ancient world, the mediæval Church, and even classical Protestantism as well! How sure were men that whatever was Divine was not human and whatever was human was not Divine, whatever was natural was not supernatural, whatever was of grace was not of nature! Nature was only evil and tended to evil, man was the child of the devil, the virtues of the pagans were only gilded vice, salvation was the conferment of something transcending humanity, not the actualization of the ideal of humanity.

Jesus, if real man, was not God manifest, and if God, was then but the semblance of man. All the major spiritual

intuitions of Jesus are in contradiction to the first principles of that intellectual system which has yet dominated Christian dogma until far down into the nineteenth century. Or, to put it differently, that system has so overlain Christian thinking that men have only recently discovered what the great intuitions of Jesus were and whither they would lead.

II.

When we come to the area of the interpretation of religion, not in the doctrinal forms which we have dealt with thus far, but in the sphere of organization and institution, of ritual and practice, we find further interesting illustrations of our same truth. Predecessors of Fox, like Henry Nicholas, had already argued that not merely is the only evidence of salvation the right life, but that the right life is itself salvation. Men are saved to goodness and not to an imagined mere external state called heaven. It is to badness, not to an outward hell, that men are lost. So much is the reward of goodness being good, the consequence, inevitable, of being bad the growing worse, that the terms reward and punishment are, on the whole, misleading. The whole drama of sin and of salvation, instead of being the field of predestination of God's sovereign will and His electing grace, of redemption purchased at vicarious cost, or righteousness imputed—all of that vast scheme so dear to Puritans—the whole drama is that of the inevitable working of the inner forces of a man's own life, even God's justice and God's mercy working always and only with and in the inner forces of the life of man himself. Even Milton had a flash of this great truth when, in the midst of naive objectivation of a Paradise Lost and against the background of a more than Dantean Hell, he makes Satan walking through Eden say: "Why this is hell, nor am I out of it. For where I am hell is, and where hell is there must I ever be."

In the face of such a sublime conception of the inward and spiritual truth as to religion, all dogmas concerning saving institutions, all assertion of necessary forms of organization, all declarations in new way of the old error as to the powers of priesthood, all emphasis upon saving rites, necessary observances

as to times and places which alone are sacred—this all shrivelled into nothing. All externalities of religion came to be deprecated and dreaded, all authority of such things repudiated, even the free use of them considered dangerous as tending to lead back again into the old bondage. Freedom had been bought at a price and had daily to be defended at a better cost.

George Fox was not the first man to have discovered that "Presbyter was but another name for Priest writ large." James Stuart had once said that Monarchy agreed with Scottish Presbytery about as well as God with the devil. The communities of the Commonwealth were in the way of discovering that it agreed quite as little with the liberty of the Christian subject as it did with the monarchy of the King. The priesthood of all believers had been one of the initial contentions of the Reformation. But seventeenth-century Protestantism, with small areas of exception, knew as little about it as if the phrase had never been heard. Or, if one choose to be ironical, that right seemed to exist mainly in the fanaticism with which every chance man in those days of confusion made of himself not merely priest but Pope, and anathematized and excommunicated all those who differed from himself.

It was in the mystical sects that the sense survived, that this priestliness of the individual is not merely a right to be seized upon. It is a solemn, even an unbearable responsibility in the sight of a merciful and pitying God. We have passed through struggles as to the authority of Church and Scripture and reason since that time. But all the while the responsibility of the single soul before its God and as over against any authority which approaches from without, remains just what these mystics said. There is no authority but God. And even God makes Himself felt only through the free motions of the soul.

Implicit in this assertion of unlearned men and women two hundred and fifty years ago, five hundred years, two thousand years ago, is the whole of the theology of an immanent God. But to say that these devout souls knew the argument for their conclusion would be ridiculous. They knew the conclusion. They had against them all the might of that part of the world which never moves but step by step. That means the exclu-

sively intellectual. They had against them all the might of that portion of the world which prefers not to move at all. That is the ecclesiastical. That which has become axiomatic to our generation was axiomatic to them also ten generations ago—but for exactly the opposite reason. We say it is clear because the premises will yield no other conclusion. To them it was clear because, despite the logic which they did not know how to answer, there was no other conclusion in which a soul sufficiently religious could find rest.

The literalists of the Scripture made a fetish of the Sabbath. In the midst of furious Sabbatarianism the mystics felt the truth of that which Jesus said—the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath. To the man of God all days were alike sacred, though not necessarily all alike. If one were kept sacred in a different fashion from the rest, that was only in order that its being kept in that fashion might serve for the enhancement of the sacredness of all the rest. It was no end in itself, but only means to the end of the great sacredness which was to be the whole tenor of life itself, the normal life of man in family and state and world.

Similarly, rites and ceremonies can be but means of the expression and of the deepening of the religious feeling. They may be natural as such expression. They are artificial, dead and deadly when they usurp the place of such feeling. They may lead to simulation and—what happens more commonly—may foster an illusion. They pass on into superstition. They induce the pathetic state of things in which not alone those may have much of religion who are thought to be without it, but equally those may be quite without it who think that they have most of it.

The bibliolater of the time was as sure, each one for himself, that the form of church government which he approved was the only one Christ designed, as was any Catholic in his way. The Quakers held, in effect, that all organization tended to evil. They shared with the mystics of all ages the instinct which underrated that aspect of religion, in which it is an impulse to the formation of a community. They formed a community. Many of the mediæval mystics had utterly refused to do that. The Quakers formed a community. But it had the appearance

of a concession to the existing state of things, the only means of gaining currency and giving permanence to the ideas which were precious to their own souls.

The religious organization is, indeed, such a means. But it is more than that. It is an expression of one aspect of the very nature of religion itself. The history of Quakerism, even the career of George Fox himself, shows that in any larger way the noblest and most effective ministry is unattainable except as some men and women feel a peculiar call to it and really give themselves to the ministry. With all emphasis upon spontaneity, surely none have ever given themselves more truly to the habits and practices of the devout life, to the routine and custom of worship, both public and private, than have certain of the Friends. And where they have not thus given themselves to some habit and practice of the devout life, there is nothing in the doctrine of the Inner Light or in the theory of universal nearness to God to keep men from falling off most lamentably from God and from all the deeper meanings of man's life. It is only a question of the nature and ground of that routine and of the spiritual prudence with which we freely adopt it, rather than of the superstition in which we are subjected to it. The truth is that, as regards all these things against which we sometimes wax zealous in the interest, as we think, of a true and spiritual faith, they do not stand related to one another as in the familiar image of the kernel and husk. The true image is not that of kernel and husk. It is that of body and soul. Important as it is to recognize the perishableness of the body, yet no soul lives and works without its body. Its body is in a way as necessary to it as it is, in turn, to its body.

It is often said of, and said by, the Unitarian body, in the midst of whose historic preserves I live, that it would be far larger than it is were it not for the fact that its truest contentions have been practically adopted by many Churches besides. Time was when their seer, Channing, predicted that in America at any rate where there was so much less of tradition to resist them, they would carry everything before them, because of the congruence of their main ideas with the spirit of the times. That has not come true.

If all of the prophetic quality which we have ascribed to the

Quakers and George Fox was really theirs, if our world has but caught up in its slow-footed fashion with so much that they surmised, it might be open to some one to ask, Why, then, does not this company, also of the children of the prophets, come to its own, inasmuch as, in a way, the whole world has, in such impressive fashion, come to them?

I wonder if George Fox would not have answered that question too. It is true that to dislodge an organization one needs to build up a counter-organization. But yet if you do that your own organization will in turn fall a prey to the decay or perversion which has been inseparable from all the rest. It will need, in turn, to be dislodged. It is true that for the propagation of a set of ideas an institution specifically devoted to that task is the appropriate instrument. But if what you wish to transmit is not a set of ideas, but a spirit, then the fruit of your work will less easily be counted or measured by any of the conventional standards. That will not prove that you have not been very fruitful. Then the fruit of dissemination of your pure and beautiful spirit must not be looked for entirely, or even mainly, within an ecclesiastical organization, which bears a particular name. It must be looked for among men of all other organizations and of no organization, among Christians of every name and among Christians not consciously such. There is a great difference between being a prosperous sect and a vast and potent influence. The two things do not necessarily exclude one another, though they are likely to do so. But for a religion of the Inner Life and Light the latter would seem to be the appropriate and characteristic way.

If Christ's law be true, that to save one's life one must lose it, I do not see why that law is not applicable to institutions and movements as much as to individual men. It seems quite obvious that some fierce ecclesiastical organizations have lost their lives by perpetuating and enlarging them.

It seems equally obvious that some other movements and impulses, especially of the religious sort, have saved their lives by losing them, have become immortal and well-nigh omnipotent by sinking themselves absolutely in the mind and life of masses of men, to whom they possess no obvious and outward relation. I wonder if Fox saw this. It would have been like

him. There is certainly a truth here for us to see and one worthy to be pondered in our time. A man is reputed a prophet by dint of that which a subsequent age is in a position to patronize him for having said which has come true. He really was a prophet by dint of that which the men of his own time heard him say, but did not believe was true. Columbus did what he did for the world by believing that America was there far down the western horizon, when nobody else believed it. But he became a lauded discoverer only after there were many more men in the world, and some of them very commonplace ones, who knew all about America.

It is possible that Fox and the mind of his type is recognized by us as that of the discoverer, because we feel that wherein he transcended the mind of his own age. Is it not equally possible that he is still prophetic, in our age, of that which we do not believe to be true? With our faith in organization and machinery we are at the opposite pole from him. But it may be he is right. In his attitude as to punishments by the state, as to prisons, as to war, etc., I am sure that he is right. And the world apparently has still a long way to go before it will come up with him. And yet upon what did he base these conclusions, save on his sense of what was worthy of God and best for man? Am I not right, that it is the religious spirit which is the discoverer?

THE QUAKER CONQUEST.

Conquest means more than victory or triumph. It carries with it the quality of permanence. A victory today may have a reversal tomorrow, but a conquest continues its effects until they become permanent conditions. A conquest may be by physical force or it may be produced by a moral change or by a change of sentiment. Physical force may compel submission and obedience without producing a change in either character or sentiment. A moral change goes far deeper and by conviction and a new point of view reaches the foundation of things, and produces a new character into which new lights shine and from which a new fruitage is produced.

The history of England furnishes a striking example of each of these types of conquest: The first was of the date 1066, the other reached the determining stage of its consummation in 1689. The Norman Conquest was obtained by valor in arms. The conquest by which religious liberty was obtained was won by a higher type of valor, that of quiet suffering and patient endurance.

It is not necessary to recount the persecutions of Quakers in England. They are matters of English history. After George Fox began his ministry much of his life was spent in prisons. His followers suffered in like manner. The persons and the estates of Quakers suffered continual violence. It was a time of violence but the Quaker was the only protestant against whom Churchmen and Puritan and Presbyterian joined in their fury. But the English people had hearts and consciences and there was a limit beyond which persecutions could not go. When their conscience was aroused they called a halt. The coming of the Prince of Orange to the throne furnished the opportunity for the righting of the grievous wrong of which the nation had become conscious and the passage of the Toleration Act quickly followed.

The Act of Toleration was drawn to apply to all dissenters but the Quakers were given special and peculiar consideration by Parliament. George Whitehead with three associates went

before the parliamentary committee and in consideration of their request the phraseology of the act was so shaped as to meet their views concerning the Holy Scriptures and the confession of faith which the act prescribed. But there remained the difficulty of the oath of allegiance which the act required. In lieu of this a formal declaration of loyalty was accepted. Nor was this all. As Friends made no use of the ordinances they were made exempt from certain requirements of other dissenters for giving assent to the canon of the Church of England in reference to the Eucharist and the admission of the truth of the greater part of the thirty-nine articles. I conclude the English portion of my subject by quoting from Augustine Birrell's Preface to the recently published "Quaker Post-Bag," "One thing in the strange history of the Quakers stands out in the clearest relief. Despite their bold denial of all the Sacraments and of any kind of formal priesthood, or ministry, denials which, in the first instance, brought down upon their covered heads the whole forces of all the hatreds of Christendom for once united, they nevertheless were the first, and for a long, long time the only Nonconformists to obtain the protection of the law. This they won, not by political strife, but by a sublime indifference to consequences, legal or social. Unable to swear, they found the courts closed against them, when in pursuit of their civil remedies. They submitted in silence, and were the more careful not to make bad debts. Marriage was only to be had within the walls of the Establishment. All other Nonconformists, wishing to wed, went to church, at least once in their lives, fearing bastardy for their offspring. The Quakers feared nothing, did not go to church, kept their own marriage registers, and made it a matter of religion never to die intestate. This attitude of sublime indifference was soon found intolerable. In 1676 the Quakers were allowed to affirm in courts of justice and later their marriages outside the walls of either church or chapel were recognized. No such consideration was shown to other Nonconformists for a century or so. Quaker history stands alone in its indomitable success."

It is not necessary to repeat the story of the persecution of the Quakers in Massachusetts. That story is well known. It went to extremes never attempted in England. The Puritan

had come to establish a religious commonwealth. None but those who were of one mind and one practice were invited to come and the Puritans firmly believed that they had the right to exclude all others. The harshness of their methods of exclusion and the extremes to which they were carried shocked the Christian world. The government of Massachusetts felt it necessary to issue an official apology in justification of their acts, and Governor Endicott sent an address to King Charles upon the subject. The effect upon the common people of the province is shown in a letter written by one James Cudworth, who had been a magistrate and a commissioned officer in the military. He says "The Quakers have many meetings and many adherents. Their sufferings are grievous and sadden the hearts of most of the pious and virtuous part of this Commonwealth; it lies down and rises up with them, and they cannot put it out of their minds."

After the force of public opinion compelled a cessation of the persecution the final legal steps were not consummated until the new charter for the province was obtained in 1691. That charter shows very clearly that it was prepared in Massachusetts. The endless details could never have been inserted otherwise. In its confusing verbiage one clause stands clear and explicit: "And we do grant, establish and ordain that forever hereafter there shall be a liberty of conscience allowed in the worship of God to all Christians (except Papists) inhabiting or which shall inhabit or be resident within our said Province or Territory."

The results of the Massachusetts experience reached into other New England colonies. As both Roger Williams and the Quakers who settled on Rhode Island had experienced Massachusetts intolerance, religious liberty was a foregone conclusion for Rhode Island and the Providence plantations. Roger Williams in 1636 declared his object to be "the settling of the plantation and especially for the receiving of such as were troubled elsewhere about the worship of God." So also those eighteen who came from Boston in 1638, twelve of whom had just arrived from England, and purchased of the Indians the island on the east side of Narragansett Bay, known by the Dutch as "Rhoode Eylandt," and elected William Coddington

their chief magistrate, established liberty there. The united government went into operation in 1647, and in 1663 King Charles granted the celebrated charter that remained for 180 years the supreme law of Rhode Island, both as colony and state, and only gave place to a state constitution in 1843.

We now come to the division of our subject that embraces matters not so generally known and which furnishes the reason for the preparation of this paper. It requires the narration of events which led to the official establishment of religious liberty in New York and New Jersey, the far reaching effects of which it is impossible to estimate.

It was but natural for the Quakers, driven out of Massachusetts, to look to the Dutch for religious toleration. The Puritans themselves had gone to Holland to find religious liberty when they had been compelled to flee from England. The Dutch had founded New Amsterdam under the director-generalship of Peter Minuit in 1625. The first settlers were Walloons, driven out of the southern provinces of the Netherlands by the religious bitterness following the protracted war with Spain. These Belgic provinces were strongly Roman Catholic and their protestant people took advantage of the opportunities offered by the newly organized Dutch West India Company and sought new homes along the shores of the Hudson River. They settled also upon Long Island and explored and claimed the shores as far east as Block Island and Rhode Island and westward to the Delaware. Under Minuit and his early successors all settlers found the liberties they desired.

Friends from Massachusetts early settled upon Long Island so that in 1657 ministers, among whom were Robert Hodgson and Robert Fowler, held meetings at Hempstead, Jamaica, Flushing and Gravesend. Their number steadily increased and Flushing and Oyster Bay became important Quaker centers. The most prominent man among them was John Bowne. He came from Matlock in Derbyshire, England, where he was born on the 9th of March, 1627, and was baptized in the parish church on the 29th of the same month. The family came to America in 1649 and in 1651 or the following year John Bowne settled at Flushing. Subsequently he and his wife joined the Friends. The Friends meeting was regularly held at their

house. The records of the meeting after his death has the following entry: "John Bowne died at Flushing, 20th day of Tenth month 1695, and was buried the 23d of the same, being about sixty eight years of age. He did freely expose himself, his house and estate to the service of Truth, and had a constant meeting at his house near about forty years."

Peter Stuyvesant became director-general of New Amsterdam in 1647. His oath of office required "the maintenance of the reformed religion in conformity with the decrees of the Synod of Dort-recht, and not to tolerate in public any other sect." The charter of 1640 declared "And no other religion shall be publicly admitted in New Netherlands except the Reformed as it is at present preached and practiced in the United Netherlands."

Under these regulations Governor Stuyvesant considered it to be his duty to enforce the law and prohibit the holding of conventicles anywhere within his jurisdiction in accordance with an ordinance of the West India Company of 1662 which provided that "beside the Reformed religion no conventicles shall be holden in houses, barns, ships, woods or fields, under the penalty of fifty guilders for the first offence, double for the second, and arbitrary correction for every other." The execution of these restrictions fell alike upon all who were not of the church of Holland, but its greatest severity was the portion of the Quakers.

Friends were of one mind in reference to their right to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences and many suffered imprisonment for this. The greatest severity of the law fell upon John Bowne who was arrested September 1, 1662, charged with "harboring Quakers and permitting them to hold their meetings at his house." He was taken a prisoner to Fort Amsterdam and on the 14th of the same month the "court held by the Lords, Director General and Council at Fort Amsterdam in the New Netherlands" entered the following judgment: "Because John Bowne, at present prisoner, dwelling in Flushing upon Long Island, has made no scruple in vilipendation of the orders and mandates of the Director General and Council of the New Netherlands, we do in justice to the high and mighty states of the United Provinces and the

administrators of the West India Company of the Chamber of Amsterdam, having heard the demand of the substitutes and the acknowledgment of the prisoner, have condemned and do condemn the said John Bowne by these presents—boete—5 and 20 pounds Flemish with the charges of the Justinian, and with express admonition and interdict to abstain from all such forementioned meetings and conventicles, or else for the second boete he be condemned to a double boete, and for the third boete to be banished out of this province of New Netherlands."

John Bowne refused to pay the fine and was then confined in a dungeon and restricted to bread and water. On the 31st of October he was put on board ship and sent a prisoner to Holland. He arrived at Amsterdam on the 29th of January, 1663. The authorities of New Netherlands forwarded a statement of the case for the adjudication of the authorities in Holland. The officials of the West India Company drew up a paper for John Bowne to sign. In reply he sent to the company the following statement: "Friends, the paper drawn up for me to subscribe I have perused and weighed, and do find the same not according to that engagement to me through one of your members, viz: that he or you would do therein by me as you would be done unto, and not otherwise. For which of you being taken from your wife and family, without just cause, would be bound from returning to them unless upon terms to act contrary to your conscience, and deny your faith and religion, yet this in effect do you require of me and not less. But truly, I cannot think that you did in sober earnest ever think I would subscribe to any such thing, it being this very thing for which I rather chose freely to suffer want of the company of my dear wife and children, imprisonment of my person, the ruin of my estate in my absence there, and the loss of my goods here, than to yield or consent to such an unreasonable thing as you thereby would enjoin me unto. For which I am persuaded you will not only be judged in the sight of God, but by good and godly men, rather to have mocked at the oppressions of the oppressed and added afflictions to the afflicted than herein to have done to me as you in like case would be done unto, which the royal cause of our God requires. I have with patience and moderation waited several weeks expecting jus-

tice from you, but behold an addition to my oppression in the measure I receive.

"Wherefore I have this now to request for you that the Lord will not lay this to your charge, but to give eyes to see and hearts to do justice, that you may find mercy with the Lord in the day of Judgment.

JOHN BOWNE."

In April John Bowne was released. He returned to America by the way of England and the Island of Barbadoes.

The authorities in Amsterdam sent to the officials of New Netherlands the following decision, dated Amsterdam, April 16, 1663: "We, finally, did see from your last letter, that you had exiled and transported hither a certain Quaker named John Bowne, and although it is our cordial desire that similar and other sectarians might not be found there, yet as the contrary seems to be the case, we doubt very much if rigorous proceedings against them ought not to be discontinued except you intend to check and destroy your population, which, however, in the youth of your existence, ought rather to be encouraged by all possible means.

"Wherefore it is our opinion that some connivance would be useful that the consciences of men, at least, ought ever to remain free and unshackled. Let every one be unmolested as long as he is modest, as long as his conduct in a political sense is unimpeachable, as long as he does not disturb others or oppose the government. This maxim of moderation has always been the guide of the magistrates of this city and the consequence has been that from every land people have flocked to this asylum. Tread thus in their steps and we doubt not you will be blessed.

(Signed) The Directors of the West India Company, Amsterdam Department.

ABRAHAM WILMANDOUK,
DAVID VON BAERLE."

This was regarded and acted upon as a decree of full religious liberty. It has peculiar historic interest because of the fact that it was the first official proclamation of religious liberty for

any part of America except that of Lord Baltimore for Maryland.

The continuation of Dutch authority was brief. New Amsterdam was seized by the British in 1664, was retaken and occupied by the Dutch and finally passed permanently to the British authority.

In the final surrender twenty-three articles of capitulation were agreed upon.

Article VIII stated "The inhabitants here shall enjoy the liberty of their consciences in divine worship and church discipline." These articles were confirmed by the treaty of Westminster in 1674. This was the most advanced and complete recognition of religious liberty thus far established in any part of the British dominions. Thus, the rights obtained under the Dutch government by John Bowne and his fellow sufferers became the English law of all the territory transferred from the Dutch to the English. This domain included not only the territory of the present state of New York, but all of New Jersey as well, for the Dutch authority extended to the Delaware.

When Charles II wrested their North American possessions from the Dutch he granted them in bulk to his brother, the Duke of York, who in turn granted what is now New Jersey to John Berkeley and Sir George Carteret. The Berkeley-Carteret grant was covered by the Articles of Capitulation. The first grant to the Duke of York had become extinguished by the Dutch conquest. Upon the retransfer of New Netherlands to England the King issued a new patent for New York and New Jersey to the Duke of York and from this new patent all legal authority was derived. This was subsequent to the treaty of Westminster. New grants of New Jersey were made to the Berkeley-Carteret parties—the former now represented by John Fenwick. When in 1676 West Jersey was opened to settlement by the Friends, under the dominant spirit of William Penn, six years before Pennsylvania was founded, they entered into the heritage secured by their brethren of Long Island.

The Quaker settlement on Long Island came by way of New England and the meetings organized there had official connection with New England; and this continued, until the year 1695

when New England Yearly Meeting set up the Yearly Meeting of New York as an independent body. Hence the story of the Quaker conquest of New Netherlands is a part of the history of the body whose two hundred and fiftieth anniversary we are now celebrating.

Much has been written of the influence of the Quakers upon the public thought and the public policy of English-speaking peoples but in the light of these studies a new significance is given to the title chosen by President Gregg of the Western Theological Seminary of "The Quakers as Makers of America," and to the statement of John Fiske that "All that now remains is to set up on Boston Common, the scene of their martyrdom, a fitting monument to the heroes that won the victory."

Doubtless in the progress of time religious liberty would have been secured for all America by other means, but the facts of history make it clear how it was obtained.

The efficacy of quiet suffering, of patient endurance, of passive resistance in any contest with bitter prejudice, with evil passion and with brute force results from the operation of the law of all God's universe that like begets like, that hatred breeds hate and loving wins love. Count Leo Tolstoi narrates that he was once reading the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth to a wise man of the East. As the sage heard them one by one he claimed that each was known among his own people and was not original with Jesus. At length he read "Ye have heard that it hath been said an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, but I say unto you resist not him that is evil, but whosoever will smite thee on the right cheek turn to him the other also;" the wise man exclaimed "This is new, this is original." It was indeed the first enunciation of a great and potent law. It was a great contribution to the moral wisdom of the world. It is the secret of the greatest conquests the world has known.

But great and potent and universal as is this law it has been a stumbling block to modern Christendom. Men have not believed that Jesus meant what he said and they are still making apologies for resisting evil with evil. The Quakers believed it and in acting upon it they had God on their side and of course they won in every contest, whether it was in England or in America. It has been truly said that of all Christians the

Quakers have taken Jesus Christ most seriously. John Morley, in his life of Cromwell, says "Quakerism was undergoing many changes and developments but in all of them it has been the most devout of all endeavors to turn Christianity into the religion of Christ."

With a courage that was sublime they faced the dungeon and the scaffold, never rendering obedience to evil, never resisting the agencies of evil with any like agency, never wearying in their endurance of suffering, until their enemies became their friends.

The Quakers obtained their conquest by the same means the Master used for the conquest of the world. Jesus' patient endurance of wrong and passive resistance of evil, and the love that suffered so long and was kind made His death shame the wickedness of the world, brought men to conviction and contrition and achieved the greatest conquest ever known.

ADDRESS

By Isaac Sharpless

About the year 1700 two antagonistic conceptions of Christian life and duty were in conflict in the northern colonies of America. One which we may call the Calvinistic, rigidly demanded literal orthodoxy as applied to all the relations of life. Its test was the Bible, both the Old Testament and the New. Its deductions from this authority were enforced by invincible logic and any variations from the acceptance of the conclusions were sufficient to place the doubter out of the pale of the Christian fold. If it did not make the state and the church a united body, it did demand that the state should enforce the decrees of the church, and that orthodoxy should be a test of capacity for public service. A godly commonwealth, with the Bible interpreted by skilled theologians as its basis, was the aim of its several policies.

The other conception for convenience we will call the Quaker conception. It, too, acknowledged the authority of the Bible, but the New Testament rather than the Old was back of this recognition. Its tendency to literalness was tempered by another doctrine that nothing outward was absolutely essential to the reception of divine truth but that God and man were in direct relation and communion with each other and the divine will could be and was received by those who were in a responsive attitude without the medium of priest or book. This took away some of the hardness from their theology and created tolerance and kindliness in their relation to other bodies. The conscience of every man was supreme for him. No power had a right to demand its abrogation. It might be, and probably in most cases would be, more or less erroneous as measured by the standard of abstract truth, but it would tend to rectify itself in so far as it was pure and alert. It could not, therefore, allow itself to crush the conscience of another by any decrees of state. Its godly commonwealth must be gained not by legal enforcement,

but by spiritual convincement, and where it had control there were no favored churches.

Nor was it certain in 1700 which of these two tendencies was likely to prevail. By this time something of the rigidity of New England orthodoxy had abated and the Friends were spreading at a rapid rate in Rhode Island, Long Island, for fifty miles in every direction from Philadelphia, and to some extent in the South. They were still possessed of some of the enthusiasm which the first generation had brought over from England from the days of their suffering and devoted zeal. George Fox had impressed upon them the idea in his earlier ministry that they were not founding a sect, but preaching a spirit which would gather into its fold in time all the Christian bodies; and something of this catholic outlook was still existent.

If we compare the bodies which are the lineal descendants of the Calvinistic conception with those which trace their lineage back to a Quaker ancestry, it would seem at the present time as if the Calvinists held the field, and the Quakers were an insignificant and relatively impotent body. If we compare, however, the spread of the ideas for which Calvinism stood with those held by their opponents, it is the Quaker conception which rules the thinking Christian world, and Calvinism has capitulated, thrown aside by its own organizations. The literalness and the rigidity of Puritan theology have gone and no churches would more surely deny them than those who have kept the denominational name and machinery of the early Puritan sects. The Quaker ideal has permeated church and state. Its fundamental theology of direct divine communion is almost universally accepted and its position in regard to church freedom in the state finds no opposition. We have the curious spectacle of the principles of a sect once relatively strong finding their way into almost complete acceptance while the body itself has continually dwindled in size and direct influence. On the other hand we find the followers of the other tendency originally of equal or perhaps greater vitality who have grown more and more in numbers and force while at the same time they have accepted in frank acknowledgment the principles which they once opposed. The Puritan bodies have deserted their principles and flourished. The Friends who have always held the trium-

phant throne of life and religion have barely held their own in numbers and have lost some of their characteristic basis.

I have not time to analyze this interesting situation. It is worth a volume. I can only state what seems to me to be one reason for its existence. The Puritan body founded Harvard in 1636, and Yale in 1701. It founded them primarily to provide a highly educated ministry. Students were not confined to this class but, had it not been for this want, these colleges would never have been called into being at the time they were. The Friends did not feel such a need. Their doctrine of the sufficiency of divine guidance in ministry made them less careful to create a theological center. There was, therefore, no Quaker college in the colonies and Friends grew up, not by any means ignorant, for they were, up to a certain stage, well and universally educated, but without the great leadership of the congregational bodies. A necessary condition of progress is far-seeing leadership. A body whose education is mediocre may be very worthy but is not very progressive, and the Friends with all their inclination towards justice and righteousness were hardly as open to adapt themselves to changed conditions as the bodies which in every locality had at least one trained leader who kept in touch with advancing thought and to some extent carried his congregation with him. And so it came about that Friends became in time more or less imitators of the past rather than developers of new truth, while the Puritan bodies were frank enough and wise enough to abandon untenable conditions and adapt themselves to advancing thought. The effect of two such opposing tendencies could not long remain in doubt. A defensive organization would gradually waste itself away, however effective as a defense it might be, while another which led out into the wide fields of growing thought and knowledge, if it had always a profound desire and regard for the truth, would find itself through many tribulations entering into a larger inheritance.

From this characterization of Quakerism we must except their attitude towards questions of moral reform. Here they have always been leaders. Why, it is difficult for me to tell, and I can think of no better reason than the one which they themselves would probably have given, that when they got together in their

silent meetings, or still more silent, secret chambers, with a desire to know God's will, they really got what they asked for. They were certainly not more intelligent than other bodies nor were they more responsive to external influencés, nor were they in a general way more anxious for the right thing, and except for this devotion to their consciences and their belief in its enlightenment by the Divine Voice their priority in many moral movements would be difficult to explain. But certain it is that they have reached positions which the best tendencies of the future have frequently justified. Why did they, one hundred years before lotteries were a recognized evil, alone among the churches, refuse to have anything to do with them and kept all of their enterprises clear of them? Why did they in the days of the early development of the anti-slavery movement again take positions about one hundred years ahead of the Christian civilization around them? Why have they consistently preached the views into which the Nation is just entering with regard to the unrighteousness and inexpediency of war? Why were they pioneers in the establishment of hospitals and insane asylums on modern principles? Is any other explanation of these things possible than the one which we have intimated?

On the other hand that which the Friends everywhere, down to the last half century, held as their most priceless possession, the meeting for worship, free, without human head or leader, without prearrangement of services, without any compulsion upon any one to speak unless the divine impulse was felt, with the recognition that to hear the Divine Voice there must be the attentive and responsive soul in silence before it, without distinction of worldly condition, as to learning, or station, or sex, or age, *this meeting* seems not to have met the recognition among Christians which the attitude of Friends to moral problems has commanded. It is indeed spoken of as a beautiful opportunity for a few mystical souls, but for the busy American multitude the pragmatic test is applied. And there it seems to fail. In Great Britain it holds its own among Friends and in certain sections of this country. There are some of us who believe that it will come to its own again, that prophetic ministry is not an impossible ideal, that individual worship in silence in the congregation is still an achievement not only beautiful but

very practical, that the revelation of God's will comes down in double portion upon such a waiting company, that such a simple form is almost the necessary logical consequence of what is most vital and potential in the principles of Quakerism.

But here again while the churches in general have not adopted our theory they have allowed it to modify their own and could we but be intelligently faithful to it we could probably work it out on the side of church prosperity. But as a distinguished bishop has recently said, "Just as we were about to adopt the Quaker theory, at least in part, you flopped over to the other side." It is true that this "flop" came as a reaction from an untenable and unprofitable traditionalism but it carried with it something that was precious and it seems to me essential to the *raison d'être* of our Society as a distinctive body. Some of us may have to trace our steps backwards into logical unity with our fundamental historic position.

Historically speaking, a great change, it seems to me, came over the Society of Friends as a result of the Revolutionary War, and this change has created the Quakerism which many of us have known in our earlier years and which in many places seems to be passing away. The change had a double effect. It on the one side increased the tendency towards that devotion to the past which in certain ways produced stagnation and incapacity for adaptation. On the other, it drew the forces of Quakerism together and made them more loyal and more devoted to the special principles which were recognized as fundamental. The history of Friends up to the end of the eighteenth century was very largely identical in the different colonies. The same forces, the literature, the itinerant ministry, the reverence for the first generation, were at work, producing similar results, and while the facts which I am going to state are based on investigations among the Friendly records of Philadelphia I feel quite sure that they will apply with almost equal significance to New England, New York, or the South.

It is probably not correct to say that the Friends were Tories in the Revolution, if by Toryism one means sympathy with the British crown and its exactions. Some of the more influential merchants of Philadelphia, undoubtedly were, as were their counterparts in New York and Boston, but there is very little

evidence that the body of Friends sympathized with the British. Their official attitude was one of neutrality, not because they believed the American side was in the wrong, but because they believed that war and revolution were not justifiable under the circumstances. In Philadelphia something like four hundred of them were disowned by the monthly meetings for actively joining the American cause. So far as I know, there are no records of more than a half dozen who were similarly treated for participation with the British, and I suppose that these four hundred men who joined the Continental Army or who took part in the state government, represented a considerable population who were prevented by their peaceful scruples from joining the movement.

The yearly meeting as a whole adopted a policy of non-participation in government as a result of the war and the quiet unaggressive spirit which had been developing in the Society some years prior to the Revolution was brought to a head by the stress and strain of war times. The Friends seem keenly to have felt the change which resulted in their position before the public. Hitherto they had been the rulers of the state and had impressed themselves upon its institutions. Now they were, over large districts, unpopular and proscribed and often penalized by fines and imprisonment. It seemed to them that this might partly be due to their unfaithfulness. In the midst of the struggle their yearly meeting urged what they called "a reformation." That reformation was worked out through all the subordinate sections with great fidelity and the products of it had a permanent effect upon the succeeding generations down to the present time. It comprised several features:

(1) In the first place, the long drawn out struggle against slavery must be brought to a conclusion. First testifying against the slave trade and then against the iniquities of slavery itself, finally against slavery as an institution under any and all circumstances, they gradually had brought their membership up to the point of general manumission. A few members, however, held back, and now it was decided that the skirts of the Society must be absolutely clear. While the armies were marching through the country, committees were going around

among the few remaining slaveholders urging them not merely to release their slaves but to pay them the debts which they owed for unrequited services, and if the efforts of this committee were unsuccessful, the disloyal Friends were to be removed from membership, so that during the time of the war the last Quaker slaveholder disappeared from the North.

(2) In the second place the same service was performed toward the matter of tavern keeping. Taverns in Colonial times had been part of the necessary machinery of travel, and both solid and liquid refreshment were assumed to be part of the entertainment, but the drinking habits of Friends had become a matter of concern as well as their slaveholding habits, and while total abstinence as a principle was not much taught, the sale of liquor was so evidently fraught with evil consequences that it was generally felt that Friends could not engage in it, and after visiting committees had worked on the subject, the matter was brought to a termination during the war. While one committee reported the last of the slaveholders, another was reporting that the last of the tavern keepers had agreed to give up the business.

(3) These were matters of moral import, but other questions were also impressed in this "reformation." One was the matter of schools. There had been many small Friends' schools during Colonial times, so that most Friends had been taught the elements of education, but this was not at all general, and besides the schools were, to a large extent, mixed, and were not accomplishing the purpose of shielding the youth from supposed demoralizing influences. Still another committee, therefore, acting upon the advice of the yearly meeting, was going about among these meetings during the war urging the establishment of schools under the care of school teachers with Friendly sympathies and influences so that every child could be reached by these educational advantages. This also was successful and set the pace for the future in the matter of education. It meant that all Friends' children should receive elementary education and this result was brought about. It meant also that this elementary education should be, so far as possible, denominational and separate from outside influence, and it also meant no provision for higher education, so that except in private

ways there was probably less opportunity for college training in the Society of Friends for a number of years after the Revolutionary War than there had been previously when many Friends were taking the matter in their own hands.

(4) This reformation also meant the closing up of the ranks in support of the peculiar testimonies of Friends and made them more and more separate from the world. They felt that it was a lack of this fidelity to the teachings and methods of the past that had brought them into trouble in defending themselves from external encroachments; that they must be absolutely faithful to their religious duties, their attendance at meetings and their care of each other; and that they must separate themselves, so far as possible, from all other denominational influences. Their reading was to be narrowed very largely to Friends' books and their attendance at other places of worship was to be prohibited. They were to bring up their children in strict observance of the simplicity which was laid upon previous generations and a committee to carry out this part of the concern visited families, first to their own houses to see that no superfluous furniture or decorations existed and then the same general concern was extended to the membership in general. Here again the committees labored through the war times when the sympathies of the membership were cemented by common suffering and when the faithfulness of many Friends had produced an enthusiasm for the cause which previously had been somewhat lacking. The rather exclusive type of Quakers with which many of us have been familiar resulted, it seems to me, from tendencies which had their strongest impulse at the time of the Revolutionary War.

And so there settled down upon the Society of Friends as a result of this great national cataclysm, a zeal for moral reforms and a rigid standard of personal morality, in every way admirable; a devotion to historic Quakerism, of unreasoning fidelity, in many respects pure and beautiful, but not in accord with the progressive spirit of American life and which, untempered by a broad intellectual outlook, resulted in the divisions and diversions of the past century.

It remains for us, in this era of colleges and wider views, to gather together the essential features of Quakerism where our

Colonial fathers left them, throwing aside unchristian attitudes on the one hand, and the opportunist spirit, the desire for quick returns, which leads into all manner of anachronisms on the other, and gathering ourselves into the spirit of early Quakerism, give to the world an effective though perchance for a time weak demonstration of a simple direct progressive religion, a demonstration which America needs and which she will accept.

RESPONSES

Interesting responses for their several Yearly Meetings were made by the following delegates:

Amos Kenworthy,	for	California	Yearly	Meeting
James Moore,	"	Western	"	"
Clarence M. Case,	"	Iowa	"	"
Paul Wright,	"	Wilmington	"	"
Edward Mott,	"	Ohio	"	"
Timothy Nicholson,	"	Indiana	"	"
L. Lyndon Hobbs,	"	North Carolina	"	"
Walter Haviland,	"	Philadelphia	"	"
Allan C. Thomas,	"	Baltimore	"	"
James Wood,	"	New York	"	"
Edward N. Mennell,	"	London	"	"

THEN AND NOW

By L. Hollingsworth Wood

The Quaker of the olden time!
  How calm and firm and true
Unspotted by its wrong and crime
  He walked the dark earth through!
The lust of power, the love of gain,
  The thousand lures of sin
Around him had no power to stain
  The purity within.

With that deep insight which detects
  All great things in the small
And knows how each man's life affects
  The spiritual life of all,
He walked by faith and not by sight,
  By love and not by law;
The presence of the wrong or right
  He rather felt than saw.

He felt that wrong with wrong partakes,
  That noting stands alone,
That whoso gives the motive makes
  His brother's sin his own.
And pausing not for doubtful choice
  Of evils great or small,
He listened to that inward voice
  Which called away from all.

O spirit of that early day,
  So pure and strong and true
Be with us in the narrow way
  Our faithful fathers knew.

Give strength the evil to forsake,
The cross of Truth to bear.
And love and reverent fear to make
Our daily lives a prayer.

J. G. Whittier.

Friends can hardly expect me speaking to a young people's meeting to feel that all the Golden Age is in the past.

That there have been heroes and heroines whose lives were brilliant gleams in a dark time and bands of devoted men and women who did magnificent service for their age we have had abundantly proven to us.

That Friends were once a great force, religious, moral and political, there is no doubt. What interests me is the glory which has not departed from this Israel and while paying the tribute of admiration to the glorious men and women of our past and gathering inspiration from the resplendent examples of their lives, are we not right in feeling that our service is a glorious one and for the present and that our hopes and aims must be for the future.

In the subject "Then and Now" I do not suppose it was the intent to limit us to 1661 and the first yearly meeting which was held here for Friends in New England, but also New York and New Jersey so that we feel that we are joining in a celebration with a sense of proprietorship as well as the ownership which comes by love.

How great is the debt of Quakerism past and present to New England it is without the limits of this paper to discuss but that we are all eager to acknowledge it is evident from the gathering here today and in the response of every Quaker assembly to the messages of Whittier or Jones or Barton which stir us to nobler aims and better deeds.

So in our discussion tonight, let us consider the Friends "Then" as of the whole period when Friends were knocking at the door of opportunity and driven out by a desire to serve were undertaking journeys or attacking positions, religious, legal or political, which stirs our admiration.

England at the time of the rise of the Quakers was in a most troubled state and one fitted to make the wisest counselors shake

their heads for they had no precedents to follow. "In England they had become," as the historian Green puts it, "the people of a book and that book the Bible."

When Bishop Bonner set up the first six Bibles in St. Paul's (quoting from an old letter) many well-disposed people used much to resort to the hearing thereof especially when they could get any that had an audible voice to read to them.

The language of the Bible became the language of the people and we find such extraordinary names among the children of some of the Roundhead or People's party as Dust of Ashes and Oil of Gladness.

It was to a people divided between the pleasure loving gentry of the royal adherents and those who groaned beneath the harsh doctrines of Calvinism that these men and women who had found "one even Jesus Christ who could speak to their condition" came with their inspiring message of Light and Truth.

They had hardships to endure both from the natural difficulties of travel and from the opposition that their idea of equality met at the hands of those in power whether church or state for all parties joined hands against such preachers of equality and democracy.

They were robust times (for which we have a lurking admiration) and people who were in a position to exercise authority were not apt to be called to account for putting some wandering preachers in jail. They had strict laws against vagabonds and very likely they were needed. Jails were not pleasant places of sojourn. Elizabeth Fry had not begun her work to better conditions and even if one felt no disgrace in going to jail for a principle it was an experience of physical hardships such as might well deter a stouter heart than many of us would feel like claiming.

(I doubt whether New England would have been troubled by the Wood family if the invitation had been issued by Mary Dyer to accompany her in the "cause of Truth" to hospitable Massachusetts.)

But holding meetings which were apt to be broken up by force and the leaders arrested and thrown into jail seems to have appealed to them. Starting on voyages in the little boat called

the good ship *Woodhouse*, found a goodly company of Friends ready to embrace the risk.

Truly they had giants in courage in those days.

We can gather some idea of how they must have lived from the journals. Everything was of course much simpler than now. We read that George Fox did at one time wear a leather suit, at another that they found his linen so good as to cause the investigators to respect him.

There is frequent mention of the adjournment of arguments or trials because the Quakers' opponents were hungry, as if Friends were above such troubles, but there are many other reasons for thinking that Friends of the early days were very human and, though fired with a great enthusiasm which sustained them at many times, were still quite as sensitive as their fellows to the hardships to which they were subjected.

Hardships did not deter the Quakers of the olden time nor were they unmindful of them and for an example I have chosen to quote from the Journal of the Quaker St. Francis of Assizi, John Woolman, where in his Journal of his visit to the Indians he says (page 175):

"After a hard day's journey I was brought into a painful exercise at night in which I had to trace back and view the steps I had taken from my first moving in the visit, and though I had to bewail some weakness which at times had attended me, yet I could not find that I had ever given away to wilful disobedience.

"Believing I had under a sense of duty come thus far, I was now earnest in spirit beseeching the Lord to show me what I ought to do. In this great distress I grew jealous of myself, lest the desire of reputation as a man firmly settled to persevere through dangers or the fear of disgrace from my returning without performing the visit might have some place in me; full of these thoughts I lay a great part of the night while my companion slept by me till the Lord my gracious Father who saw the conflicts of my soul was pleased to give quietness. Then I was again strengthened to commit my life, and all things relating thereto into His heavenly hands and got a little sleep toward day."

Mary Dyer did not leave her husband and family in Rhode Island and insist on returning to Boston, nor John Bourne sub-

mit to imprisonment and transportation, as he expressed it in his letter to the Directors of the West India Company, from any love of adventure.

To any person reading the account of these times a most insistent "Why" must always press for answer.

We go over the list of testimonies, radical though they were, without finding an explanation which satisfies, however much we may admire them.

Testimonies against war, against oaths, against outward baptism, against hireling ministry, against death penalties, against rank or social prestige, are all splendid, but they did not vitalize those shining lives. They were only avenues of expression of their positive message. They had received a knowledge of God, a conception of their oneness with Him and a partaking in His all-embracing love which made war impossible. A realization of the baptism of the spirit which made water baptism partake of unreality, a communion with the divine nature which made any outwardly administered ordinance of the Lord's Supper seem to them a sham.

Democracy had a reason in their conception of an intimate love of God for and in all men so that they must cry out against injustice and unequal laws and oppressive acts, slavery, religious bigotry and social distinctions as defiance of the divine love, and a message, whether to Indian or black man was listened to as a manifestation of that same love.

Everything was the result of that transcendent experience that Jesus Christ can speak to their condition, not necessarily in the words He used to Peter or Nicodemus or Pilate, but in the words which apply to thy life and mine.

The people who received the message which Fox had to preach had to be about the business of helping their fellows and in no half-way measure.

Some went one way, some another. The militant methods of Mary Dyer and William Leddra and the other Friends who upset the narrow religious and political oligarchy of the Puritans contrast rudely with the marvelous spirit of John Woolman, but they were all fired with the same zeal for service.

It is well known that Mary Dyer and William Leddra and the other martyrs at last forced Governor Endicott to sacrifice their lives to the prejudice which controlled the administration in the colony and so brought about its downfall, but as an example of the wonderful spirit which brought Friends to action against prejudice or wrong, let me quote again from Woolman's account of his service during which he spoke in New England yearly meeting against lotteries. He writes:

"In this debate it appeared very clear to me that the spirit of lotteries was a spirit of selfishness which tended to confuse and darken the understanding, and that pleading for it in our meetings, which were set apart for the Lord's work, was not right. In the heat of zeal, I made reply to what an ancient Friend said, and when I sat down I saw that my words were not enough seasoned with charity. After this I spoke no more on the subject.

"At length a minute was made inviting Friends to labour to discourage the practice amongst all professing with us.

"Sometime after this minute was made I remained uneasy with the manner of my speaking to the ancient Friend and could not see my way to conceal my uneasiness though I was concerned that I might say nothing to weaken the cause in which I had laboured. After some close exercise and hearty repentance for not having attended closely to the safe guide, I stood up, and reciting the passage acquainted Friends that though I durst not go from what I had said as to the matter, yet I was uneasy with the manner of my speaking, believing milder language would have been better. As this was uttered in some degree of creaturely abasement, after a warm debate it appeared to have a good savour amongst us."

Again the spirit in which he met the questionings of London yearly meeting shows the abiding grace with which their message imbued them.

John Woolman's ship had just reached London after a very rough passage, during which he had suffered a great deal of hardship owing to his refusal to travel in any greater comfort than the sailors. He heard that yearly meeting was in session and went straight from the ship to the meeting house. Upon his entry some curiosity was aroused by his strange appearance

for his dress was peculiar as he refused to wear anything which was dyed and when he told the meeting of his concern to come to them for service some Friends quite bluntly said they thought his concern might now be satisfied if he returned home. The sweet spirit which had braved the hardships of the passage in a great sense of love was much crushed by this response and sat a long time in tears, but finally, feeling called to speak, said he had no desire to be chargeable to any of them, but if they would help him to his trade (a tailor) he would support himself. He then felt a message was given him to deliver. After he had spoken the Friends who had opposed his further service were the first to bid him stay and proceed with his "concern."

Though they differed in method in every case there was the fire of dedication to some exalted purpose.

Whittier in his time speaks in the poems which we know best with calm and trustful spirit. He voices a message which is welcomed everywhere and claimed by all branches of Friends, but it is a voice enriched and ennobled by a life given with an all-absorbing devotion to a cause. A warmth and glow which are the blossom and fruit of sacrifice.

The Quakers "then" had a glorious possession. They felt themselves living exponents of the Heavenly Love.

And what of Quakers now?

Is the glory all in the sunset?

Are there only the "dykes our Fathers made to our great profit and ease."

Are there any Quakers now? Would Fox or Burroughs or Pennington or Governor Endicott recognize us or would Roger Williams row the length of Narragansett Bay for an argument with any Quaker of today? In the formal hasty business meeting of the monthly meeting of today what would happen if some Mary Fisher expressed her concern to visit the Sultan of Turkey in the cause of truth? Have separations, pastoral system, holiness movements, modern thought, ancient practices and twentieth century conditions worked our undoing? Has anyone

seen handwriting on the wall and are the words Mene Mene Tekel Upharsin?

To Friends of today the handwriting reads Arise, shine for thy light is come and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee.

The Quaker now is asking questions as George Fox was and we are thankful for it. To young Friends (The Friends of Now) the vision of Pendel Hill is being shown again and in the response which they are making our forefathers will recognize their children and as we gather in meetings like this in peace conferences in fellowship pilgrimages but, more than all in any united service, we feel their acknowledgment.

Is history repeating itself?

As we see the progress in the fruits of Christian ideals in the world, the lives and fortunes spent in helping unfortunates, the constructive thought given to charity, the growing enthusiam for social service, does it suggest that the world has gone ahead of the church in practical Christianity? Does it resemble Fox's time when the fresh knowledge of the Bible and a quickened public conscience was running away from the formal state religion?

Has our guarded religious education tended to herd us behind the dykes our fathers built and keep us pleasantly occupied while the world, which needed us and which we needed, has been sweeping by us at flood tide?

In the movement among young Friends which has been noticeable in the last ten years we find an earnest of a change. Friends' children have taken to independent thought at last.

In England the rise of the movement for adult schools marks an awakening of Friends to the needs of the world. Studies of the causes of drink and poverty, re-entry of Friends into politics with the Liberal party, work of the visiting parties to unused meeting houses or week-end tramps with meetings held in country villages, a willingness to be very different from others if necessary but very real and informal are signs of a very sturdy life.

The work of the Yorkshire 1905 committee, which was appointed to carry on the plans of John Wilhelm Rowntree after his death and which interests itself in every sort of helpful spiritual service, such as schools for workers where they can receive higher training at small cost with great freedom as to hours for

lectures, is inspiring and it does inspire. The helpful influence of Woodbrooke and of the consecrated lives which have been gathered to aid those who will avail themselves of its opportunities has made itself felt in many meetings of all branches of our Society here in America as well as in England. The growth of Christian Endeavor Societies, the formation of Quaker Round Tables to study Friends principles, the organization of fellowship circles, the activity of young Friends in social service in our communities are evidences of quickened life.

Young Friends, as witness the work of your fellowship group to make themselves of use to the yearly meeting are coming forward in our meetings. In eight out of the thirteen epistles received in New York yearly meeting mention was made of increased interest and activity on the part of the young people.

The Quaker Round Tables, Study Classes and Young Friends Associations are organizing a Fellowship Pilgrimage to Amesbury and Haverhill in the Ninth Month. It is cheering to know that there are such organizations and they are coming together not for a literary treat but for a fellowship which will reach out into service.

I quote the following from the epistle from Iowa yearly meeting, 1909:

"Our Evangelistic work has been encouraging. We note with especial gladness the work of the 'Gospel Teams' companies of young men who have gone out from our College for evangelistic work; these with the hope and enthusiasm of youth, with unwavering faith in God and His word have labored in different fields and many have been won to Christ. The influence of their labors upon the young with whom they have come in contact has been effective in helping them to a true conception of Christianity and the possibilities of youth consecrated to God."

For better or for worse the young people of our Society are going out into the world and, as they feel its rush and see its need, they are looking about to bring aid, and by the aid they bring, the world will judge them and their God.

Today there is an unrest greater and more widespread than was possible in Fox's time. Problems of immigration face us that his time could not know. Mixtures of races with divergent customs and viewpoints produces a condition no country has

ever faced before. Over a million strangers to our customs and laws landing on our shores each year is a situation which confronts us. The development of a public opinion which bids fair to disrupt our time-honored political parties, a demand that the people enjoy what is theirs, in place of the few who are in advantageous position, are signs which show life, perhaps danger, and the insistent cry against corruption in our high places; the increasing demand for reduced cost of living; the success of government supervision of public utilities all show an awakened public life.

And the awakening is not confined to the United States. Popular government in Persia would have seemed an idle dream five years ago. Japan, India, even China and Africa are awake. The world must be led to Christ today. Into the unrest must come a people with a message. It is to such a world that the Friend of today must speak. To quote from an editorial in the American Friend-Signed R. W. K.:

"It is for us to say just now whether they shall come to the light of His glory. The message that was carried down to us through long toilsome centuries must be passed on to nations that are making quick choices. If we really believe that 'through the ages an eternal purpose runs' and that according to the great purpose we have been led into the true light, then the hour has struck for us to arise and shine."

And what of Friends message to such a world which it must be the duty of the Friend of today to voice?

In the heat and turmoil of New York in Seventh Month last a conference of representatives of various yearly meetings of Friends of all branches was held on the subject of Peace." The speakers who addressed the meetings were all Friends with the exception of one who was a Socialist of prominence.

The stenographer who had been employed to report the proceedings of the conference had his first experience of Friends at these meetings. When he delivered the notes of the meeting he said to me, "I enjoyed that work more than anything I have done since I came to New York. Everyone who spoke spoke from the point of view of love except the Socialist and he spoke from the viewpoint of hate."

The message of Friends had been voiced to that man and he

had heard it for all branches of Friends were united in some definite work.

John Woolman's message was one of love and his statement that "I have cause to acknowledge with humble reverence the loving kindness of my Heavenly Father who hath preserved me in such a tender frame of mind that none, I believe, have ever been offended at what I have said," shows us the power with which such a message speaks.

The message of Fox and Woolman was theirs as they were able to lay hold on the eternal truths of God and this came because of a life with God. So we can only have a message as we have such a life.

Always there will be a message for such simplicity as they lived out in everything. What is direct appeals to us all. It is the directness of the child which astounds us. Our Quaker message is the message of direct contact with God lived as if we believed it.

To the Society of Friends has come this year a voice speaking in our own tongue a lesson of marvelous power. I refer to the message from China.

To all Yearly Meetings of Friends:

The Sz-Ch'wan Yearly Meeting of Friends in China sends a letter of greeting to our beloved Friends and fellow-workers with the Lord, for your respectful perusal. Our Society has been established in the Province of Sz-Ch'wan for about 20 years, and of believers in the Lord, there are many who are earnest and zealous. We regret that hitherto we have been lacking in not having communication with your Meeting, and in not enquiring respectfully after your welfare.

We remember that you and we—as Friends—originally spring from one stock, and although we live in different countries, yet the Lord we serve is but One; we ought, therefore, in the spirit of the love of Christ, to have always fellowship and union with you. It is the desire and hope of us who are so far away, that your Meeting may receive unbounded blessing from God.

This is the time of our Yearly Meeting, and we are met at

Sui Ning from our several centres, and while thus assembled, we are constrained to expressly send out this message to all Friends, and to request you to pray for us, that our Heavenly Father will increase our strength to do the good work of our Lord, for which we shall be very grateful.

Peace be to you all.

From the perspective of the mountains of sacrifice up which the missionaries climbed to carry the light to those Friends the branches of our Society seem firmly connected in the trunk of the live tree.

Can it be that we have needed a message from so far a country to show us our brother.

Is it possible that for the progress of Christ's kingdom God is demanding the kind of service Mary Dyer rendered and that for us of today the illiberal thought which demands that my neighbor accept my viewpoint as the basis of fellowship is the Massachusetts of present day calling for self-sacrifice by some Mary Dyer of our generation?

Into the world the Friend today must come with a no less exalted conception of life and the divine purposes than they had then. In a spirit of love he must throw himself into battle for the right. From a divine fire within he must be able to show a light from which other lives will kindle.

In consciousness of the Kingdom of God he will "detect the great things in the small" and in the service of the lowliest perceive the Master's footsteps.

Though the distance between the child in the famine district of India or China and the wheat pit in Chicago or New York is great, yet in the man who corners the wheat market he can see food denied to the Master and in love he will wake to make such action impossible.

In the official who neglects his duty in protecting a water supply from contamination he can see the denial of drink to the Master, who was thirsty, and will do more than his part in trying to show people their responsibility.

In any policy of tariff or monoply which increases the price of clothing beyond the means of the poor so that their children sicken in want, he can see the Master naked and not clothed and

in a people bound to the prison of the letter of a creed or suffocated in the dungeon of ritual and formalism the Master unvisited in prison.

To teach such a religion we must know it. People cannot be interested in hearsay. They insist on the facts. We must tell them of a religious experience which happens today in a city like New York or Providence under the conditions in which they live, not of one which may only have been satisfactory in Palestine or Rome. An experience of the life with God and its power comes not by easy methods.

Gladstone's expression of the "Work of Worship" must be experienced.

To preach to the world so that it can hear we must read our newspapers as carefully as our Bibles. We must join the Master in knowing what is in man, his thoughts and aims, his troubles and uncertainties.

When we join the Fellowship of the Suffering of Christ, when in the agony of our desire to join with him we realize that the wrong in the world is in a sense our fault, that if we were all doing our duty such things could not be; then we would be in a measure fitted for the "mighty ordination of the pierced hands."

To such an experience, to such a life, to such a power it is that young Friends today are reaching out.

Eager for such a spirit they are trying to learn how to pray. They are asking not for the little material things of our childhood, but they are crying out, from the distress of souls who have found themselves wanting in ability to express God to their fellows, for the fullness of union with the Almighty which will make us expressions of his purposes;

> "The love and reverent fear to make
> Our daily lives a prayer."

Let us face the facts and acknowledge our failures but in the failures let us search not for discouragements but for suggestion. Let us be original again if that is the expression of actual Christian thought. If there is any body of Christians who ought to be daring investigators in the things of the spirit it is the Friends.

We of all peoples are the freest to go to original sources and think and feel things out for ourselves. The Friend who hunts for heresy and preaches orthodoxy has missed the spirit of Quakerism as much as the one who practices water baptism. We can and ought to be pioneers and in the present movement among young friends we will be, as they are in England already.

In every subject which we consider, let us see if even what we know of what would be Christ's attitude could not be in our lives expressed, but above all let us go back to the prayer which forces us away from the things which are of the earth earthy, and which is an opening of the courses of Heaven into the channels of our life, a life not cloistered or at ease, but trained in the highest schools of efficiency, founded on the most reliant faith, brightened by the most brilliant hope, and, greater than all, made sensitive by the divine element of love.

Until we have such ability and such a union with the divine, no influence comparable to that of the Friends of our glorious past can be expected.

Even in our doubting times of inefficiency we have never felt that God was less able to use men for his purposes than He was before; and now, at this milestone in our progress, have we not strength to believe that Quakerism can have a new birth and enter into the baptism, whether of suffering or of joy, with which our master was baptized and can we not in the inspiring words which closed the Epistle from Western Yearly Meeting go forward, "Trusting in the Spirit of our God to lead us in all the adjustments necessary for efficiency under the new order."

3865